

Modern Philology

VOLUME XV

July 1917

NUMBER 3

CORNEILLE'S CONCEPTION OF CHARACTER AND THE CORTEGIANO

In the opening scene of *Cyrano de Bergerac*, Rostand makes a Parisian bourgeois say to his son:

Et penser que c'est dans une salle pareille
Qu'on joua du Rotrou, mon fils.

And the son retorts:

Et du Corneille.

Think of it: *le grand Corneille* on the plebeian boards of the Hôtel de Bourgogne in 1640! The remark, intended of course for the modern bourgeois, warns us once more against viewing the past through the wrong perspective. For Corneille was played in just such places and was immensely popular. Among countless others, witness Boileau's testimony:

Tout Paris pour Chimène a les yeux de Rodrigue.

The fact is that during the thirties of the seventeenth century the Parisian public, ever on the alert, had become enamored of the courtly type. Without doubt, this was due in part to the influence of Spain. The legend of the advice given by M. de Chalon to the young Corneille is well known: "Vous trouverez dans les Espagnols des sujets qui, traités dans notre goût par des mains comme les vôtres, produiront de grands effets"¹—as if such advice had been needed. But still more was it due to the influence of Italy. I need

¹ Beauchamps, *Recherches sur les théâtres de France*, II, 157.

only to mention the Hôtel de Rambouillet and the fact that in Italy, the *Cortegiano* type, first formulated by Castiglione in 1528, was of long and honored standing. Madame de Sévigné wrote¹ to her daughter: "Et l'italien, l'oubliez-vous? J'en lis toujours un peu pour entretenir noblesse."²

In treating Corneille's conception of character, my object is to show how close it is to the Italian *Cortegiano* type, and furthermore to point out what were the possible points of contact. The most effective way of bringing the matter forward is first to review what the critics have had to say on Corneille's treatment of character. This, then, will constitute the first division of this paper.

I

It is a commonplace to state that Corneille is the dramatist of the will. All French critics agree on this essential fact. For instance, Lanson, *Histoire*, 429:³ "Il a et il exprime une nature plus rude et plus forte, qui a longtemps été la nature française, une nature intellectuelle et volontaire, consciente et active. . . . Il a peint des femmes toujours viriles, parceque toujours elles agissent par volonté, par intelligence, plutôt que par instinct ou par sentiment." And in his *Corneille*, 94,⁴ Lanson says: "Ce misérable *Œdipe*, où Corneille a surabondamment prouvé combien toute la poésie tragique des Grecs échappait à son intelligence, n'est qu'une protestation de la volonté contre la fatalité. . . . Sur cette idée se fait la distinction des caractères de la tragédie de Corneille." And Lanson then proceeds to classify the characters as: "les généreux,

¹ Letter of June 7, 1671.

² Under the date of June 13, 1637, Chapelain writes to Balzac: "J'apprens aussy avec plaisir que le *Cid* ait fait en vous l'effet qu'en tout nostre monde. La matière, les beaux sentimens que l'Espagnol luy avoit donnés, et les ornemens qu'a adjousté[s] nostre poëte françois, ont mérité l'applaudissement du peuple et de la Cour qui n'estoient point encore accoustumés à telles délicatesses. . . . En Italie, il eust passé pour barbare et il n'y a point d'*Académie* qui ne l'eust banni des confins de sa jurisdiction." It is clear that Chapelain is here speaking "en docte": cf. the *Épître to La Suivante* (privilege, January 21, 1637), where Corneille says: "puisque nous faisons des poëmes pour être représentés, notre premier but doit être de plaire à la cour et au public, et d'attirer un grand monde à leurs représentations. Il faut, s'il se peut, y ajouter les règles, afin de ne déplaire aux savants, et recevoir un applaudissement universel; mais surtout gagnons la voix publique." Cf. also Ogier, preface to *Tyr et Sidon*, 1628: "Les doctes, à la censure desquels nous déferons," etc.

³ Third ed.

⁴ *Grands écrivains français*, 4th ed., 1913.

les scélérats, les faibles": Rodrigue, Polyeucte; Cléopâtre, Attila; Félix, Cinna—the last of whom he aptly calls, "âme de chambellan dans un emploi de Brutus." Or take Lemaitre (Julleville, IV, 273): "Cet orgueil, cet héroïsme content de soi, ces pétardes de la volonté, cette emphase, cette redondance, rempliront tout le théâtre de Corneille et, en général, toute la tragédie française jusqu'en 1650. . . . L'étonnant Alidor de *la Place Royale* est le frère aîné des Pulchérie ou des Camille (*Othon*).” Thus Lemaitre finds the same principle in the "ironie et dédain" of the early plays of our author; compare:

quand j'aime, je veux

Que de ma volonté dépendent tous mes vœux. [*la Place Royale*, vs. 207.]

But no critic has emphasized the point more than Brunetière, who in his *Histoire de la litt. franç. classique*, II, 190, says: "On a dit à ce propos, et personne avec plus d'exagération que V. de Laprade, que le principe du théâtre cornélien serait le triomphe du devoir sur la passion. Si cela n'est déjà qu'à moitié vrai du *Cid*, rien ne l'est moins d'*Horace*,—où je ne pense pas que le 'devoir' d'Horace fût d'égorger sa sœur Camille;—ni de *Polyeucte*, dont le 'devoir' serait de triompher de sa passion de martyr; et rien n'est plus faux de *Cinna* même, de *Théodore*, de *Rodogune*, d'*Héraclius*, de *Nicomède*, où nous ne voyons plus en lutte les unes contre les autres que des passions, des ambitions, des jalousies, des haines, des vengeances. Ce qui est plus vrai, ce qui l'est même absolument, et ce qu'il faut dire, c'est que le théâtre de Corneille est la glorification ou l'apothéose de la volonté."¹

Without being casuistical—and discussions of the will readily lend themselves to this fault—every attentive reader will admit that to state the problem thus is to state a half-truth. For example, Alidor in *la Place Royale*, who is strong-willed, is only that, whereas Rodrigue in the *Cid*, and especially Polyeucte, are equally wilful, but something more besides. And it is this additional factor that counts in our author's greater works. A reference to this second element is to be found in Lanson's "une nature *intellectuelle* et *volontaire*, *consciente* et *active*," or less clearly in Brunetière's

¹ It might be added that Faguet, *Dix-septième siècle*, 10 ff., treats Corneille again from the point of view of passion and duty: "le goût de l'aventureux et du brillant devient chez les héros de Corneille la passion du devoir." This is true if we mean by "passion" that which is consciously willed.

further statement that: "cela veut dire que dans l'extraordinaire et dans le romanesque l'instinct de Corneille préfère ce qui est noble à ce qui est bas, ce qui exalte l'âme à ce qui la déprime, et généralement enfin ce qui fait les héros à ce qui fait les monstres," though predominantly his view is that "la volonté est le seul ressort de l'action" (194). In fact, having granted Brunetière his point, and it is obvious that both critics value the energetic side of Corneille as a national asset,¹ Lanson proceeds to say: "Les troubles de la volonté sont souvent des incertitudes de l'esprit qui ne voit pas le vrai; ses égarements sont des erreurs de l'esprit, qui croit voir et voit mal. La pire bassesse est de n'avoir ni fermeté de volonté ni clarté de connaissance. La perfection héroïque est d'avoir la connaissance claire et la volonté ferme: quand l'âme voit le bien et marche au bien sans une défaillance"² (*Corneille*, 96).

Thus it will become clear that the two elements which govern the dramatic system of Corneille are: (1) a clear or rational concept of an ideal, often typified by his characters as their *souverain bien*; (2) the enlistment of the will in the service of this ideal. The poet's characters react, not to their attachment to an individual, but to the more or less perfection of which they believe that individual capable. Chimène loves Rodrigue, not for himself, but because of his heroism, and to be worthy of his heroism she herself must be heroic;³ the struggle in the *Cid* is not single, it is double: a struggle on the one hand in the characters themselves between love and duty, and on the other a struggle to make the two ideals agree. The play closes with the significant words addressed to Rodrigue:

Pour vaincre un point d'honneur qui combat contre toi,
Laisse faire le temps, ta vaillance et ton roi.⁴

¹ See especially the admirable last page of Lanson's *Corneille*.

² Or this passage in the *Histoire* (429): "Rien de plus caractéristique que sa théorie de l'amour. . . . L'amour est le désir du bien, donc réglé sur la connaissance du bien. Une idée de la raison, donc, va gouverner l'amour. Ce que l'on aime, on l'aime pour la perfection qu'on y voit: d'où, quand cette perfection est réelle, la bonté de l'amour, vertu et non faiblesse."

³ Cf.

Tu n'as fait le devoir que d'un homme de bien;
Mais aussi, le faisant, tu m'as appris le mien. [*Cid*, vs. 911.]

Note the difference with *Las Mocedades*, II, vs. 290, on which the passage is based:

Yo confieso, aunque la sienta,
Que en dar venganza á tu afrenta
Como caballero hiciste.

⁴ In the Spanish play the idea of honor is imposed from without; in the *Cid* it springs from within, from the consciousness in the characters of their own dignity. "Certes," says Martinenche, *La comedia espagnole*, 208, "il arrive parfois dans le *Cid* qu'on regrette l'éclat pittoresque de Guillen dans de trop abstraites traductions." "Traductions" is hardly the right word!

Or take *Rodogune*: two characters are bound by brotherly affection, yet they love the same person, Rodogune, who, in turn, loves the younger, but can marry only when their mother is slain. The situation—*romanesque* in the extreme—is an impasse, which can be solved only through the use of the improbable; yet this enables the poet to multiply motives and again to point the lesson of the heroic.¹ What is there left, in *Nicomède*, for Attale to do, when he once realizes the lofty serenity of his unshakable brother, than to admire from afar his

vertu dans son plus haut éclat;
Pour la voir seule agir contre notre injustice,
Sans la préoccuper par ce faible service?

No wonder Corneille was forced to admit in the preface to *Héraclius*: "le sujet d'une belle tragédie doit n'être pas vraisemblable," and that Chapelain—*en bon critique*—dwelt on the necessity of verisimilitude in the *Sentiments sur le Cid*.²

Two questions at once suggest themselves. The first is: To what extent is Corneille's ideal of character that of his own age? And the second is: To what influences is he indebted for its formulation? A third (which, however, I shall have to leave unanswered) might be: How did this ideal affect his attitude toward the doctrine of the unities?

The elementary facts as to the poet's environment are well enough known. Corneille was a Norman, and Normandy—as far as such observations hold—is the home of the rationalist.³ Calvin and Malherbe were both from the north, and while Calvin resembles Corneille in being a casuist (see Brunetière, *op. cit.*, p. 196), Malherbe is even closer to him in substituting reason for sentiment in poetry. Moreover, Corneille received his early training at the Jesuit Academy at Rouen, from 1615 to 1622; indeed, he won two prizes there for excellence in Latin verse, and, as Lanson (*Histoire*, 423) points out, the Jesuits were later the defenders of the free will against the

¹ See Faguet, *Dix-septième siècle*, 1894, pp. 9 ff.: "Du sujet extraordinaire, qui était une loi dramatique de son temps (!), il a fait le sujet héroïque."

² See Colbert Searles, *University of Minnesota Studies*, III, 27 ff.

³ Thus Gaston Paris, *Poésie du moyen âge*, II, 66: "Voilà bien la poésie du 'pays de sapience.' Il faut noter ce caractère positif et quelque peu sec qui se mêle à toutes les productions littéraires des Normands, comme la tendance pratique la plus nette se mêle aux expéditions les plus hardies de ces 'coureurs héroïques d'aventures profitables (Taine).'"

Jansenists. Add to this the fact that the poet was trained for the bar, and the logical, positivistic side of our author is explained.

But Lanson (*Corneille*, 166 ff.) goes a step farther, and after rejecting Brunetière's reproach of unreality and inhumanity in the dramas, he says: "Tout ce que le théâtre cornélien perd du côté de la couleur historique, il le regagne en intense actualité. Il nous offre une fidèle et saisissante peinture de cette France de Richelieu, de cette classe aristocratique qui inaugurerait la monarchie absolue et la vie de société. . . . Jamais la politique et son alliée l'intrigue n'ont eu plus de jeu, n'ont plus occupé les esprits." And further: "Tous les grands hommes de l'époque, ou presque tous, sont des hommes de volonté." I would not underestimate the value of Lanson's contention, especially since he qualifies the above statement by adding (p. 170): "Sa tragédie n'est jamais un reportage, c'est évident. Mais la vie contemporaine l'enveloppe, l'assiège, le pénètre: elle dépose en lui mille impressions qui se retrouvent lorsqu'il aborde un sujet, qui, à son insu, dirigent son choix. . . . Il pense le passé dans les formes et conditions du présent [What poet doesn't?]." Clearly Nisard's statement: "Après Corneille il restait à la tragédie à se rapprocher de la vie," is too absolute.¹ One has but to read his plays to realize that the poet had in him the traits of the salon-frequentener, the politician, the *frondeur*. The interesting thing is the particular type of life he reflects, and how he reflects it. His early plays reveal his sympathy with the *précieux* classes; why should not his later?

Examining his work from this point of view, we find that Eraste in *Mélite*—the first of his plays—says (vs. 13):

Son œil agit sur moi d'une vertu si forte:
Qu'il ranime soudain mon espérance morte,
Combat des déplaisirs de mon cœur irrité,
Et soutient mon amour contre sa cruauté.

Cf. *Horace*, vs. 577:

Que les pleurs d'une amante ont de puissants discours,
Et qu'un bel œil est fort avec un tel secours!

or *Polyeucte*, vs. 87:

Sur mes pareils, Néarque, un bel œil est bien fort:
Tel craint de le fâcher qui ne craint pas la mort.

¹ Quoted by Faguet in his *Propos de théâtre*, I, 90.

The Infanta in the *Cid* is assuredly a kind of Julie d'Angennes toying with love:

L'amour est un tyran qui n'épargne personne:
Ce jeune cavalier,¹ cet amant que je donne
Je l'aime. [*Cid*, vs. 81.]

or

Mais si jusques au jour de l'accommodement
Je fais mon prisonnier de ce parfait amant,
Et que j'empêche ainsi l'effet de son courage,
Ton esprit amoureux n'aura-t-il point d'ombrage? [*Cid*,
vs. 495].—

lines which reflect as much the tricks of the *ruelle* as the influence of the *Astrée*. It is unnecessary to multiply the instances.²

As for politics and *raisons d'état*, they appear from the very beginning; e.g., in the king's rôle in *Clitandre*. But compare more especially the following:

Mais on doit ce respect au pouvoir absolu,
De n'examiner rien quand un roi l'a voulu. [*Cid*, vs. 163.]

Horace, ne crois pas que le peuple stupide
Soit le maître absolu d'un renom bien solide:
Sa voix tumultueuse assez souvent fait bruit;
Mais un moment l'élève, un moment le détruit;

C'est aux rois, c'est aux grands, c'est aux esprits bien faits,
A voir la vertu pleine en ses moindres effets;
C'est d'eux seuls qu'on reçoit la véritable gloire;
Eux seuls des vrais héros assurent la mémoire.
Vis toujours en Horace, et toujours auprès d'eux
Ton nom demeurera grand, illustre, fameux.

[*Horace*, vs. 1711.]

The calculated flattery of these lines is, of course, obvious. Why Corneille should wheedle the "court" in this particular play will be seen later. At present let us note how close to Balzac's *Le Romain* (edition of 1644, pp. 2 ff.) his conception of the character is: "Il [the

¹ The first edition of the *Cid* reads *chevalier*.

² See, however, *Rodogune*, vs. 151:

Un grand cœur cède un trône et le cède avec gloire;
Cet effort de vertu couronne sa mémoire;
Mais lorsqu'un digne objet a pu nous enflammer,
Qui le cède est un lâche, et ne sait pas aimer;

and *Nicomède*, vs. 432:

Pour garder votre cœur je n'ai pas où le mettre;

vs. 735:

Comme elle a de l'amour elle aura du caprice.

Roman],” says Balzac, “estime plus vn jour employé à la *Vertu*, qu’une longue vie delicieuse; vn moment de Gloire qu’un siecle de Volupté: Il mesure le temps par les succez, & non pas par la durée.” And again: “Rome estoit la boutique; où les dons du Ciel estoient mis en œuvre, & où s’acheuoient les biens naturels. . . . Elle a sceu mesler, comme il faut, l’art avecque l’aventure; la conduite avecque la fureur; la qualité diuine de l’intelligence, dans les actions brutales de la partie irascible. . . . La principale piece de la vaillance ne dépend point des organes du corps, & n’est pas une priuation de raison, & un simple regorgement de bile, ainsi que le *Peuple* se figure.”

Obviously, Madame de Rambouillet—to whom Balzac is writing—Balzac himself, Corneille, La Calprenède,¹ the Scudéry, *e tutti quanti*, are of the same literary family. Mairet and Du Ryer in the drama,² and Desmarets in the novel,³ had shown the possibilities of Roman history, and Corneille followed suit. But it is especially in the later plays that the political interest is strong and that the maxim “l’histoire est un cours de politique expérimentale” dominates the poet’s mind. Thus *Nicomède* treats the question of “alliances,” *Sertorius* that of civil war, *Pompée* the “raison d’état,” *Othon* and *Pulchérie* the election of an emperor.⁴ In all these as in *Cinna* and *Rodogune* feminine intrigue holds the boards, and we get such maxims as:

La fourbe n’est le jeu que de petites âmes. [*Nicomède*, vs. 1255.]

Un véritable roi n’est ni mari ni père;

Il regarde son trône, et rien de plus. Régnez. [*Ibid.*, vs. 1320.]

or what Brunetière (209) calls “le naïf étalage de son machiavélisme.”

¹ Cf. Boileau, *Les Héros de Roman*, ed. by Professor T. F. Crane (especially the valuable introduction) (Boston, 1902); and Victor Cousin, *La Société française au XVII^e siècle, d’après le Grand Cyrus de Mlle de Scudéry*. Madame de Sévigné wrote (IX, 315): “Pour moi . . . je trouvais qu’un jeune homme devenait généreux et brave en voyant mes héros, et qu’une fille devenait honnête et sage en lisant Cléopâtre.” Bourciez, Julliville, *Histoire*, IV, 97: “Ces dissertations sur les Romains, dédiées à la marquise de Rambouillet, qui font les délices des hôtes sérieux de la chambre bleue et ont contribué à créer l’atmosphère de grandeur morale où s’est mue la pensée de Corneille.”

² On Mairet see Dannhelsser, *Studien zu Jean de Mairet’s Leben und Werken* (Ludwigshafen, 1888) and *Roman. Forschungen*, V (1890). Du Ryer’s first tragedy, *Lucrece*, was published in 1638, though it was probably acted as early as 1636; see H. C. Lancaster, *Pierre du Ryer Dramatist* (Carnegie Institution, Washington, 1913).

³ Desmarets’ *Ariane* appeared in 1632; see R. Gebhardt, *Jean Desmarets* (Erlangen diss., 1912), and Crane, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

⁴ Cf. Jules Levallois, *Corneille inconnu*, 1876, and the lines he quotes from *Pompée* on p. 247.

Tous les crimes d'État qu'on fait pour la couronne,
Le ciel nous en absout alors qu'il nous la donne.

[*Cinna*, vs. 1609.]

And lastly, as for the drama in particular, Rotrou's *Laure persécutée*, I, 10, contains the vigorous line:

Je veux ce que je veux, parce que je le veux.

This play was performed in 1638—that is, after the *Cid*—but three years earlier, in *l'Innocente Infidélité*, Rotrou had written:

Jamais des grands dangers un grand cœur ne s'étonne,
Et qui n'ose commettre un crime qui couronne
Observe à ses dépens une lâche vertu;

—this in spite of Lanson's just observation (*Histoire*, 438) that Rotrou learned from Corneille “à dégager les études d'âmes et de passions.”¹ Lancaster in his admirable study of Du Ryer² has pointed out that Du Ryer's *Cleomedon* (1633), the subject of which is taken from the fourth part of the *Astrée*, contains the lines so Cornelian in character:

Qui conserue un Sceptre est digne de l'auoir,

and

Qui vante ses ayeux ne vante rien de soy,

which lead the hero to exclaim:

Que ne dompterois-je animé de la sorte!

the same kind of bluster used by Rodrigue (*Cid*, V, 1) under similar circumstances:

Est-il quelque ennemi qu'à présent je ne dompte? . . .
Pour combattre une main de la sorte animée.³

Again, however, the relationship is mutual, and Du Ryer's *Scévole* (1644)—his best-known play—is in many ways a counterpart and to some extent a copy of *Cinna*.

These are only the more obvious connections. A thorough search by some doctoral candidate would probably reveal others. But, in any case, it is clear that Corneille expresses in his plays the tenets of his age, as far as we can judge them from extant literary documents.

¹ See now Georg Wendt, *Pierre Corneille und Jean Rotrou* (Leipzig, 1910).

² *Op. cit.*, 72.

³ Lancaster, p. 73.

On the other hand, as against the view of Lanson, let us not forget that the early plays—the comedies—are proportionately *more* real than the tragedies;¹ and, above all, that in ideas as well as dramatic form Corneille is primarily a leader and not a follower. With justifiable pride he says in his *examen* (first published in 1660) to *Mélite*: “La nouveauté de ce genre de comédie, dont il n’y a point d’exemple en aucune langue, et le style naïf qui faisait une peinture de la conversation des honnêtes gens, furent sans doute cause de ce bonheur surprenant, qui fit tant de bruit.” The *Cid* is another case in point; so are *Polyeucte*, *Andromède*, not to mention *Nicomède*, *Héraclius*, and *Horace*. Corneille’s leadership here is manifest. Thanks to Lanson’s study in his *Hommes et livres* (p. 132), his indebtedness to Descartes is now practically eliminated: “Le philosophe et le poète tragique ont travaillé sur le même modèle,” says Lanson, for the *Traité des passions*, which did not appear until 1649, could hardly have influenced the poet.² Even Balzac’s essays on *Le Romain* and *La Gloire*, which were known before their publication,³ are counterparts rather than sources of the poet’s works. In the latter essay Balzac says: “On a aimé l’Honneur, lors qu’on aymoît les choses honnestes. Ciceron avoit composé vn Traité de la Gloire & Brutus vn autre de la Vertu. . . . L’une et l’autre ne sont considérées aujourdhuy que comme des Biens de Theatre, qui ne subsistent qu’en apparence”; so that the stage was treating these (romantic) themes when Balzac wrote. Thus, what characterizes Corneille especially, and distinguishes him from his contemporaries, is not so much *grandeur* as a specific and systematic working out of this idea, beginning with *Horace* or even with the *Cid*. This gives his tragedies their stamp and his characters their quality. And this is why the quarrel of the *Cid* is so significant. In the preface to *Silvanire*, Mairet had emphasized two points: (1) the subject of tragedy must be known and consequently grounded in history, and (2) the law of verisimilitude must be observed—and he adduced the example of the Italians and the ancients. The first principle Corneille accepts, at the second he hedges. And for this failure he is criticized by

¹ See especially Lanson, *Corneille*, 51 ff.

² Cf. Pagnet, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

³ See Racan’s “Ode à Monsieur de Balzac” in the *Recueil des plus beaux vers*, published by Toussaint du Bray in 1630, p. 183.

Chapelain. As time went on, and Corneille felt surer of himself, his opposition to what was to be the keynote one might say of all later seventeenth- and eighteenth-century drama grew more and more insistent. In *Héraclius*, as we saw, he defies those who follow Aristotle narrowly. In *Polyeucte*—that idealist dear to Corneille's heart—unable to justify the character according to the accepted canons of pity and fear, he seeks to do so through Minturno¹ with reference to admiration, and perhaps also through Castelvetro's favorite idea of the *ingegno in trovare*² and the admiration which the public, always on Corneille's side, accords the poet. As for *Nicomède*, he frankly says: "La tendresse et les passions qui doivent être l'âme des tragédies, n'ont aucune part en celle-ci; la grandeur y règne seule, et regarde son malheur d'un œil si dédaigneux qu'il n'en saurait arracher une plainte." And it may be doubted whether this "grandeur d'âme" is equaled in any of the other plays of our author or in those of his contemporaries.

Shall we, then, attribute Corneille's formulation of character mainly to his genius? And say that his concept of the heroic, except for a certain inevitable background in life, is largely his own making. Or was there some definite model which he could have followed but which has not been pointed out? The question is easier to ask than to answer. But in view of the following facts I can at least offer a suggestion.

Corneille's attachment to the court—as opposed to "les doctes"—I noted above.³ In the *Excuse à Ariste* he expressly says: "mon vers charma la cour." In the *examen* to *Mélite* (see above), he

¹ Corneille mentions Minturno in the *examen* to the play; cf. also *Discours*, I, 15.

² Indeed, what may be a guiding principle for Corneille's inventiveness in his later dramas, beginning with *Polyeucte* (see the *examen*), is the statement of Castelvetro, *Poetica d' Aristotele Vulgarizzata*, 1570, p. 40 recto: "il poeta nell' historia certa & conosciuta particolarmente nō dura fatica niuna ne essercita lo' ngegno in trovare cosa niuna essendogli porto & posto d'auanti il tutto dal corso delle cose mōdane. Il che nō auiene nell' historia incerta & sconosciuta cōuenendo al poeta aguzzare lo' ntelletto & sottigliare in trouare o il tutto, o la maggior parte delle cose & quindi viene cōmendato & ammirato Virgilio che habbia fatto così" (cf. 2d ed., p. 67). In the *examen* of *Rodogune* Corneille says that the court always showed a preference for *Cinna* or the *Cid*, while he himself preferred *Rodogune*, and he adds: "peut-être y entre-t-il un peu d'amour-propre, en ce que cette tragédie me semble être un peu plus à moi que celles qui l'ont précédée, à cause des incidents surprenants qui sont purement de mon invention, et n'avaient jamais été vus au théâtre." See, also, the preface to *Othon*, where he declares that he has written no play in which he has been more faithful to the source and yet has shown *plus d'invention*. On the whole question, see H. B. Charlton, *Castelvetro's Theory of Poetry* (Manchester University Press, 1913), and the article of Searles cited below.

³ Pp. 2 and 7.

repeats that this play "me fit connaître à la cour." In the *Premier Discours* he explains his violation of verisimilitude by the authority of history and the pleasure of the audience "déjà tous persuadés." Moreover, Chapelain, for all his opposition, admits that the court was charmed by certain *délicatesses* in the *Cid*.¹ But the most striking testimony of a contemporary to Corneille's achievement in this respect are the words of Balzac in the Letter on *Cinna*: "Si cettui [Cinna] a plus de *vertu* que n'a cru Sénèque, c'est pour être tombé entre vos mains . . . l'empereur le fit consul, et vous l'avez fait *honnête homme*." The last remark is, I think, significant. More than once the poet has been reproached for his *orgueil*, which appears, not only in himself, but in his characters. And Lanson (*Corneille*, 196), voicing Brunetière, likens his conception of *vertu* to the Italian *virtù*. Certainly its essentially un-Christian character is apparent; to the younger Horace's boast:

Le sort qui de l'honneur nous ouvre la barrière
Offre à notre constance une illustre matière. [*Horace*, vs. 431.]

Curiace replies:

Mais votre fermeté tient un peu du barbare:
Peu, même des grands cœurs, tiraient vanité
D'aller par ce chemin à l'immortalité. [Vs. 456.]

It is, as Curiace adds, *une vertu âpre*, the full meaning of which we appreciate when we compare Bossuet's statement, evidently aimed at Corneille, in his *Maximes et réflexions sur la comédie* (ed. Calvet, 592): "Les païens, dont la vertu était imparfaite, grossière, mondaine, superficielle, pouvaient l'insinuer par le théâtre; mais il n'a ni l'autorité, ni la dignité, ni l'efficace qu'il faut pour inspirer des vertus convenables à des chrétiens: Dieu renvoie les rois à sa loi pour y apprendre leurs devoirs."

If then the ideal upheld by our poet is pagan and yet Italian in form, its prototype is perhaps closer at hand than one would suspect. At least, the foregoing remarks, especially Balzac's reference to Cinna as an *honnête homme*,² offer a clue. And this brings us to the second and main part of our study: the *Cortegiano* as a source of Corneille's ideas.

¹ See above, p. 2, note 2.

² See Petit de Julleville's comment on the letter of Balzac in his *Théâtre choisi de Corneille* (Hachette, 1904), p. 371.

II

When in 1640 Corneille read his *Horace* to a select company at the house of Boisrobert, among those present was Nicolas Faret, an intimate of Boisrobert's, who had obtained for him the post of secretary to Henri de Lorraine. Faret was a frequenter of Conrart's circle and a member of the newly formed Academy. His name has suffered unjustly from the fact that it was made to rhyme with *cabaret*—a slander against which Faret defended himself in vain since Boileau repeats the rhyme in the well-known lines of the *Art poétique*:

Ainsi tel autrefois, qu'on vit avec Faret
Charbonner de ses vers les murs d'un cabaret.¹

At any rate, Corneille knew le sieur Faret, and it is more than probable that he also knew his treatise, first published in 1630, on the *Honeste Homme ou l'art de plaire à la cour*. Others have dealt with this work,² and I do not wish to repeat here needlessly. At the same time, several questions connected with it must be noted.

In the first place, Faret's work is in large part a much abbreviated paraphrase of the famous treatise of Castiglione: *Il Cortegiano*. Of the latter work Chapelain at one time possessed four Italian editions and one Spanish translation (cf. Searles, ed., *Catalogue de tous les livres de feu M. Chapelain*,³ p. 30). To the first French translation (1537) by Jacques Colin d'Auxerre, secretary of Francis I,⁴ there had succeeded in 1580 a new translation by Gabriel Chappuis, entitled: *Le Parfait Courtisan en deux langues*.⁵ And Toldo⁶ has traced the influence of the Italian work on the treatises of Nicolas Pasquier, De Refuge, the anonymous *Courtisan françois* of 1612, the

¹ Cf. also, Saint-Amant's poem "Les Cabarets," dedicated to Faret, in Livet's edition of *Les Œuvres de Saint-Amant* (Paris, 1855), pp. 138 ff.; and for the rhyme itself, see "La Vigne," p. 170.

² On Faret, see Edouard Droz, *Revue d'hist. litt.*, 1906, pp. 87 ff.; N. M. Bernardin, *Hommes et mœurs au dix-septième siècle* (Paris, 1900), and the works mentioned below. Besides the *Honeste Homme*, on the sources and influence of which we still lack a thorough-going study, Faret published in 1623 (*chez Toussaint du Bray*) a treatise *Des vertus nécessaires à un prince pour bien gouverner ses sujets*, and a collection of *Lettres nouvelles des meilleurs auteurs de ce temps*, 1627. He also wrote an ode to Richelieu, whose life he planned to write. According to Bernardin, the *acheté d'imprimer* of the *Honeste Homme* is dated Thursday, November 14, 1630; on this see also the article of Droz, cited above. Bernardin gives interesting details on the esteem which Faret enjoyed at the court.

³ Publications of Leland Stanford Junior University, 1912.

⁴ A revision of this was made by Mellin de Saint Gelais in 1538 (Lyon); 1549 (Paris).

⁵ Lyon, 1580; Paris, 1585. Another translation appeared in Paris in 1690, entitled *Le Parfait Courtisan et la Dame de Cour*. Opdycke, *Book of the Courtier* (New York, 1903), lists nine editions of Colin and five of Chappuis, in the sixteenth century.

⁶ *Herrig's Archiv*, CIV, CV (1900): *Le courtisan dans la littérature française et ses rapports avec l'œuvre de Castiglione*.

Juvenal françois of Jacques le Gorlier, and the *Aristippe* of Balzac¹—all of which antedate the paraphrase of Faret. With so timely a subject—I repeat that the date was 1630—it is not surprising that Faret's work was very popular: it was translated into Italian and Spanish,² and as early as 1632 into English (cf. Crane, *La Société française au 17^e siècle*, 2d ed., p. 328). Chapelain seems to have had an edition of 1639, and a Lyon edition of 1661 is in the library of Cornell University. It goes without saying that Corneille, like so many of his contemporaries, may have had access to the Italian original, although I can adduce no positive evidence to this effect.

In the second place, the unknown author of the *Deffense du Cid* (1638)—one of the documents in the famous quarrel—says: "Nous voyons mesme par les places publiques des affiches qui publient l'honneste Homme ou la Morale de la Cour, celuy qui donne tiltre à sa science de la Morale de la Cour sçait bien que les vertus de la morale ne changent pas de nature en la personne des Courtisans . . . mais il cognoist la vanité commune qui pousse chacun à vouloir estre Courtisan, il les attire par l'amorce de ce tiltre à venir prendre ses instructions."³ On the basis of this passage it has been argued that the author of the *Deffense* is no other than Faret himself. This is open to doubt; but even so the defender of Corneille is plainly a partisan of the court and defends his author with the neo-Platonic argument that "the flame of Poetry springs from a certain riches of the mind which surpasses all reflexion and which originating in the soul shares in some way in the divine since it comes immediately from the image which is within us."⁴

WILLIAM A. NITZE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[To be continued]

¹ Balzac's work was not published until 1658; according to Searles, Chapelain had a French edition of 1657 (?) and an Italian translation, published in Paris in 1668. But Balzac lays the scene of his *Aristippe* in 1618, and claims that it called forth the praise of Richelieu, who himself was the author of *Instructions et maximes que je me suis données pour me conduire à la cour*, preserved in manuscript form; see Toldo, *Archiv*, CIV, 119.

² Bernardin, p. 64, knows eleven editions of Faret's book: 1630, 1631 (in 12), 1634 (in 4), 1636 (in 4), 1639 (in 8), 1640, 1656, 1660, 1664, 1671, and 1681. The Spanish translation was made by Ambrosio de Salazar, Spanish interpreter to the King; it appeared in 1634 and was republished in 1656 and 1660; on this see the interesting essay of Morel-Fatio, *Ambrosio de Salazar et l'étude de l'Espagnol en France sous Louis XIII* (Paris, 1900), especially pp. 203-14.

³ Armand Gasté, *La Querelle du Cid* (Paris, 1898), p. 122.

⁴ Cf. Faret's own preface to the *Oeuvres de Saint-Amant* (modern edition by Livet, Paris, 1855), p. 8: "Elle [la poésie] a je ne sçay quels rayons de divinité qui doivent reluire partout, et, lorsque ce feu manque de l'animer, elle n'a plus de force qui la puisse rehausser au dessus des choses les plus vulgaires."

LE GÉNÉRAL HUGO ET L'ARC DE TRIOMPHE DE L'ÉTOILE À PARIS¹

(À PROPOS DES VOIX INTÉRIEURES)

En 1836, sous Louis-Philippe, l'Arc de Triomphe de l'Étoile à Paris fut enfin achevé. Il avait été commencé sous Napoléon, après le 18 février 1806, pour commémorer la bataille d'Austerlitz et la gloire de la Grande Armée. La première pierre en fut posée le 15 août 1806, jour anniversaire de la naissance de l'Empereur.²

1814 arriva. Qu'allaient faire les Bourbons des monuments inachevés de Napoléon? On enleva l'échafaudage de l'Arc de Triomphe; rien de plus. En octobre 1823, Louis XVIII cependant décréta que l'Arc de Triomphe serait achevé, mais qu'il commémorerait les souvenirs de la guerre d'Espagne qui venait de finir.³ Aussitôt après son avènement au trône, Louis-Philippe décréta que l'Arc de Triomphe serait rendu à sa destination première, c'est à dire consacré à la gloire des armées de la République et de l'Empire. Blouet, succédant à Huyot en 1832, termina le monument pour les fêtes de juillet 1836.

Sur les murs des petites arcades se trouvent quatre bas-reliefs allégoriques qui représentent les Victoires des Armées du Nord, de l'Est, du Sud, et de l'Ouest. Au dessous des bas-reliefs sont inscrits les noms des grandes batailles de la République et de l'Empire.

Après les noms de nos victoires devaient nécessairement figurer ceux de nos généraux en chef et maréchaux, lieutenants généraux, commandants d'armée ou de corps d'armée; généraux de division, etc., qui s'y sont distingués. Dans le nombre se trouvent inscrits quelques généraux de brigade et quelques colonels. Le nombre de ces noms, qu'on se trouvait dans la nécessité de réduire en raison de l'espace disponible, s'élève à 652.⁴ Parmi les généraux

¹ Nous nous sommes servi pour ce travail, en outre des études connues de Biré, *Victor Hugo avant 1830*; Barbou, *Victor Hugo et son Temps*, et Dufay, *Victor Hugo à vingt ans*, spécialement de: *Mémoires du Général Hugo*, Paris, 1823, 3 vols.; Jules D. Thierry, *Arc de Triomphe de l'Étoile à Paris*, Paris, 1845; Duchesne, *Arc de Triomphe de l'Étoile à Paris*, Paris, 1908; Boursin et Challamel, *Dictionnaire de la Révolution française*, Paris, 1893; Robinet, *Dictionnaire historique et bibliographique de la Révolution et de l'Empire, 1789-1815*, Paris, 2 vols. sans date.

² Le 1^{er} architecte fut Chalgrin qui décida que les faces du monument seraient ornées de trophées. Il mourut en 1811 et Goust, son élève, continua son œuvre.

³ Goust fut encore chargé des travaux jusqu'en 1830. Après cette date il fut remplacé par Huyot.

⁴ Le *Grand Dictionnaire Larousse* dit que les noms inscrits sur l'Arc de Triomphe sont au nombre de 386. Il se trompe.

on trouve quelques soldats étrangers qui ont combattu dans nos rangs et qui se sont associés à nos gloires nationales [Thierry, p. 27].

M. Thierry ajoute que c'est "sous la direction et sur la proposition de M. l'architecte Blouet qu'ont été commencés et terminés les travaux de sculpture statuaire, et les inscriptions" (nous employons l'italique).

Duchesne (p. 31), d'accord avec Thierry, donne pour le nombre des généraux 652. Tous les deux citent les noms de ces généraux. Parmi ces noms ne figure pas celui du général Léopold-Sigisbert Hugo.

Pourquoi? C'est une question que le fils du général ne manque pas de se poser et même de poser à haute voix et à plusieurs reprises.

En 1837 il dédie les *Voix Intérieures* (le premier ouvrage publié par Victor Hugo après l'achèvement de l'Arc de Triomphe de l'Étoile) à son père:

A Joseph-Léopold-Sigisbert Comte Hugo, Lieutenant Général des Armées du Roi.

Né en 1774,¹ Volontaire 1791, Colonel 1803, Général de Brigade 1809, Gouverneur de Provinces 1810, Lieutenant Général 1825.

Mort 1828.

Non inscrit sur l'Arc de Triomphe de l'Étoile.

Son fils respectueux

V. H.

Dans la Préface il explique:

Quant à la dédicace placée en tête de ce volume l'auteur pense n'avoir pas besoin de dire combien est calme et religieux le sentiment qui l'a dictée. On le comprendra en présence de ces deux monuments, le trophée de l'Étoile, le tombeau de son père, l'un national, l'autre domestique, tous deux sacrés. . . . Il signale une omission et, en attendant qu'elle soit réparée où elle doit l'être, il la répare ici autant qu'il est en lui. . . . Personne ne s'étonnera non plus de le voir faire ce qu'il a fait. . . . La France a le droit d'oublier, la famille a le droit de se souvenir.

On sent combien, sous ses paroles, il y a d'orgueil froissé qu'il essaye de recouvrir de calme et de sérénité.

Dans ce même volume des *Voix Intérieures*, il écrit un poème l'"Arc de Triomphe" daté 2 février 1837, et qui se termine ainsi:

Je ne regrette rien devant ton mur sublime
Que Phidias absent et mon père oublié.

Ici encore Victor Hugo se montre blessé dans son amour filial, mais il ne réclame pas.

De fait, il était allé plus loin dans un fragment de poème paru il n'y a pas longtemps (1909) dans l'*Édition monumentale*, "Historique des *Voix Intérieures*," p. 483. Dans son "vers indigné"

¹ Victor Hugo se trompe, comme il sera prouvé plus bas.

il reprochait à Louis-Philippe d'avoir oublié le père sur l'Arc de Triomphe de l'Étoile, alors qu'il était l'ami du fils :

Sur ce bloc triomphal où revit tout l'empire,
Où l'histoire dictait ce qu'il fallait écrire . . .
Vous avez oublié, sire, un nom militaire
Celui que je soutiens et que portait mon père! . . .
Or celui dont le nom manque à vos architraves,
C'était un vieux soldat, brave entre les plus braves. . . .
Dans la guerre étrangère et la guerre civile,
En Vendée, en Espagne, à Naples, à Thionville,
Le fifre et le tambour, la bombe et le canon
Ont laissé des échos que réveille son nom.
Pourtant sur votre mur il est oublié, sire!
Et vous avez eu tort et je dois vous le dire,
Car le poète pur, de la foule éloigné,
Qui vous aborde ici de son vers indigné,
Sire! et qui vous souhaite un long règne prospère,
N'est pas de ceux qu'on flatte en oubliant le père.

29 mars 1837.

Certainement le roi se montrait très aimable envers le chef de l'école romantique s'il en faut croire ce que dit Barbou (*Victor Hugo et son Temps*, chapitre: "Louis-Philippe reconduisant V. Hugo," p. 224), et Victor Hugo lui-même dans *Choses Vues* (chapitre, "Louis-Philippe").

Pourquoi Victor Hugo n'a-t-il pas publié ces vers dans les *Voix Intérieures*? Il répond lui-même à cette question par deux notes publiées en 1909, avec les vers cités ci-dessus, dans l'Édition nationale. La première est du 29 mars 1837, jour même de la composition des vers. La voici :

Tandisque Louis-Philippe sera périodiquement attaqué par l'assassinat, je ne publierai pas ces vers.

La seconde note est de dix-sept ans après, quand il publiait *les Châtiments* et qu'il ne craignait pas de montrer sa colère immense contre les gens au pouvoir. Mais Louis-Philippe était mort et le poète aurait cru manquer de générosité en faisant imprimer ses reproches.

Après 17 ans je relis ces vers à Jersey. Je ne les publierai pas. La résolution est la même, les motifs ont changé. Louis-Philippe est dans la tombe. Je suis dans l'exil. Les proscrits n'ont rien à jeter aux morts. Quand je serai hors de ce monde, ces vers étant vrais et justes, on en fera ce qu'on voudra.

V. H.

MARINE TERRACE
24 mai, 1854.

S'il renonce à publier les vers, ce n'est pas, on le voit, qu'il ait cessé de croire à la justice de sa revendication. Il retourne à ce sujet en 1863. Nous allons y revenir; mais auparavant plaçons ici une courte parenthèse.

Dans *Choses Vues*, chapitre intitulé "Funérailles de Napoléon, 1840," il décrit la translation du corps de Napoléon à Paris. Puis il ajoute, quelques mois après le retour de l'Empereur aux Invalides :

Aujourd'hui, 8 mai, je suis retourné aux Invalides pour voir La Chapelle de Saint-Jérôme où l'Empereur est provisoirement. Toute trace de la cérémonie du 15 décembre a disparu de l'Esplanade. . . . Tout autour de la cour, au dessous de la corniche des toits sont encore collés, derniers vestiges des funérailles, les longues bandes minces de toile noire sur lesquelles ont été peints en lettres d'or, trois par trois, les noms des généraux de la Révolution et de l'Empire. Le vent commence pourtant à les arracher ça et là. Sur l'une de ces bandes dont la pointe détachée flottait à l'air, j'ai lu ces trois noms—Sauret—Chambure—Hug. . . . La fin du troisième nom avait été déchirée et emportée par le vent. Était-ce Hugo ou Huguet ?

Sauret et Chambure se trouvent inscrits sur l'Arc de Triomphe de l'Étoile. On n'y trouve pas le nom de Huguet. Victor Hugo s'était-il trompé et avait-il lu le nom de Sahuguet ?

Il faut rappeler d'abord que tous les noms des généraux de la Révolution ne se trouvent pas sur l'Arc de Triomphe. Comme le dit Thierry dans une phrase déjà citée, leur nombre était "réduit en raison de l'espace disponible."

Qui donc a fait le choix ? Louis-Philippe était-il responsable, comme le prétend Victor Hugo ?

Il serait aisé peut-être de trouver dans les archives de la Ville de Paris le nom de celui qui fut chargé de choisir les généraux dont l'Arc de Triomphe devait perpétuer le souvenir; mais il nous a été impossible même d'essayer de les consulter. Nous savons par Jules Thierry que "M. l'architecte Blouet a dirigé tous les travaux de sculpture statuaire, et les inscriptions"; mais cela ne peut signifier qu'on lui ait abandonné le choix des noms à inscrire: sa science de l'architecture, si grande qu'elle pût être, ne garantissait pas suffisamment sa connaissance des faits historiques et des illustrations militaires de la République et de l'Empire. D'autre part, il est tout aussi improbable que Louis-Philippe s'en soit occupé: on ne se figure guère un roi de France se livrant à semblable travail et un Bourbon-Orléans scrutinant et comparant, pour en soupeser la

gloire, les noms des généraux révolutionnaires et bonapartistes. Il faut chercher ailleurs.

Au fond V. Hugo pense bien, comme nous, que Louis-Philippe n'est pas personnellement responsable de la manière dont les Bourbons ont agi envers son père puisqu'il suggère lui-même une autre explication—qui d'ailleurs ne nous paraît pas plausible.

En 1863, dans *Victor Hugo Raconté par un Témoin de sa Vie* (éd. définitive, Vol. I, pp. 156-57), Victor Hugo essaye de montrer la Restauration plutôt que Louis-Philippe frappant son père en le mettant hors d'activité après Thionville, et il en donne cette raison :

On en voulait au Général Hugo d'avoir été si incommode aux alliés et d'avoir arrêté si longtemps les Hessois devant Thionville. Avoir refusé de rendre à l'étranger une forteresse française, c'était alors une trahison. . . . En septembre 1815 la Restauration se crut assez forte pour punir ceux qui avaient résisté à l'invasion des Alliés pour chasser Napoléon de la France et rendre ce pays aux Bourbons: le général Hugo fut destitué de son commandement et mis hors d'activité.

Cette accusation, sauf le fait que le général est mis hors d'activité, est tout à fait fausse comme nous allons le voir dans l'étude de la carrière militaire du général Hugo d'après ses *Mémoires*. Ainsi que le dit Dufay (p. 17) :

Sauf au commandement actif il n'avait pas trop à en vouloir aux Bourbons, et son Bonapartisme est pour le moins douteux. Une lettre du général Hugo, de Thionville, le 18 avril 1814, à M. le comte Roger de Damas, gouverneur pour le roi à Nancy, atteste la loyauté du général Hugo aux Bourbons: "Nous avons été fidèles et loyaux sous l'Empereur; le serment qui nous enchaîne au roi Louis XVIII est la garantie que nous le serons également sous lui."

Ce n'est donc pas la défense courageuse de Thionville qui est cause de la mise en non-activité du général, et comme nous le verrons, ce n'est pas non plus cette défense qui a fait omettre son nom sur l'Arc de Triomphe.

Les noms des généraux ont dû être choisis ou exclus selon certains principes: d'après le décret de Louis-Philippe on a choisi les chefs de l'armée de la République et de l'Empire (voir plus haut). Nous trouvons, en effet, les noms de généraux et même de quelques colonels (deux parmi ceux examinés par nous, p. 28) de la République et de l'Empire inscrits. Le père de Victor Hugo était-il l'un ou l'autre? Donnons-nous la peine d'examiner la chose de plus près; et pour cela livrons-nous à un rapide examen des *Mémoires*.

Joseph-Léopold-Sigisbert Hugo¹ entra au service de la France en octobre 1788. Au commencement de la Révolution il se trouvait attaché à l'État-Major général de l'armée en qualité de fourrier-marqueur. Il quitta l'État-Major général en mai 1793, en qualité d'adjudant-major-capitaine, pour se rendre en Vendée avec son bataillon qui avait pour chef Muscar, un de ses amis. Celui-ci lui confia souvent des commandements d'expédition, et enfin le promut au grade d'adjudant général, chef de brigade. Tous les deux devaient partir avec l'expédition d'Irlande en 1797. Mais ils apprirent qu'elle devait être commandée par un certain Humbert que Muscar détestait. Alors ils donnèrent leur démission qui fut acceptée. Hugo resta en activité comme adjudant-major de deuxième bataillon. Après cela, il fut deux ans en garnison à Paris comme rapporteur du 1^{er} Conseil de guerre permanent de la 17^e division militaire (devenue depuis, la 1^{ère}). Puis, il reprit ses fonctions d'adjudant-major et fut pendant un mois adjoint à l'Adjudant Général Mutilé, employé dans la 4^e division militaire.

En 1799, le général Lahorie, qu'il connaissait depuis longtemps, lui demanda s'il n'aimerait pas faire la campagne du Rhin. Il y consentit et partit pour Bâle où il fit la connaissance du général en chef Moreau. En 1800, il se trouvait sur l'Iser où Moreau le fit chef de bataillon sur le champ de bataille. Hugo accompagna Lahorie aux conférences qui se tinrent à Munich pour la suspension des hostilités. Il y eut un armistice, pendant lequel eut lieu le Congrès de Lunéville, 1800-1801, entre la France et l'Autriche. Hugo fut chargé de s'y rendre. Joseph Bonaparte était plénipotentiaire à Lunéville et c'est là que Hugo fit sa connaissance. Moreau passant par là demanda de voir Hugo et lui promit de le récompenser à la fin de la campagne par une demi-brigade et une gratification qui le mit à son aise. Joseph tint à le garder, et il lui promit de lui faire lui-même autant de bien qu'il aurait pu en attendre du général. L'armistice fut rompue; le 3 décembre 1800 Moreau se couvrit de gloire à la bataille de Hohenlinden qui força les Allemands à accepter les conditions de paix du Congrès de Lunéville, 1801.

¹ Né 15 novembre 1773 à Nancy de Joseph Hugo, maître menuisier, et de Marguerite Michaud, gouvernante d'enfant (*Archives de Nancy* par Aug. Lepage, tome IV, pp. 17 et 18; cité par Biré, *V. H.* avant 1830, p. 23). V. Hugo se trompe dans la dédicace à son père des *Voix Intérieures*. Il y donne la date 1774.

Comme Hugo attribue son manque d'avancement dans l'armée française à l'hostilité qui existait entre le 1^{er} Consul et Moreau, nous devons étudier le commencement de ces hostilités tel que le décrit Hugo dans ses *Mémoires* (Vol. I, p. 91).

On était sur l'Iser. Toutes les divisions exécutaient leurs mouvements, à l'exception de celle du général Leclerc, beau-frère de Bonaparte. Le général Guyot rendit compte de cela à Moreau, Lahorie étant présent. Celui-ci déclara à haute voix que Leclerc devait marcher. Moreau approuva et Guyot se rendit près de Leclerc, lui raconta toute la conversation et lui transmit l'ordre de Moreau. Leclerc marcha mais avec humeur, et après la bataille demanda un congé pour se rendre aux eaux. Moreau pénétra ses motifs et lui demanda de n'en rien faire. Leclerc fit solliciter par sa femme le congé qu'il désirait et qui lui parvint quelques jours après. Allant droit à Paris, il raconta tout à Bonaparte et peignit Lahorie comme un ambitieux. Bonaparte n'oublia jamais l'insulte faite à Leclerc ni la fâcheuse impression que celui-ci lui donna de Lahorie. Alors Moreau ayant demandé que Lahorie passât général de division, Bonaparte refusa. Moreau insista mais en vain. Tel est, selon Hugo, le commencement de la brouille entre Moreau, Lahorie et le Premier Consul.

Le déplaisir de Bonaparte atteignit même les officiers qui avaient eu la confiance particulière de Moreau. Comme Hugo non seulement jouissait de cette confiance mais que, de plus on le regardait comme l'adjoint de Lahorie, il se trouva doublement en défaveur. Il quitta Lunéville avec le même grade qu'à son arrivée et entra dans la 20^e demi-brigade comme chef de bataillon.

On l'envoya à Besançon en 1801, vers la fin de l'année. Là encore Hugo se fait mal voir de Bonaparte. Voici l'histoire telle qu'il la raconte dans ses *Mémoires* (Vol. I, p. 96):

A Besançon, il se faisait un trafic scandaleux. Des congés gratuitement accordés par ordre ministériel étaient vendus de 300 francs jusqu'à 1200 frs. Hugo était l'ami du chef de brigade indélicat et il lui conseilla d'arrêter cette vente infâme. Le chef de brigade n'en fit rien mais se refroidit à l'égard de Hugo. L'orage éclata; le coupable fut traduit devant un conseil de guerre et condamné. Dans sa colère contre Hugo, qu'il croyait l'instigateur de son procès,

il publia des *Mémoires* pleins d'injures contre son ci-devant ami. L'opinion publique était pour Hugo qui publia une petite feuille dans laquelle il prouvait par des faits que ces injures n'étaient fondées ni sur la vérité ni même sur des apparences de vérité. Mais il en souffrit quand même. Le gouvernement se servit de ces calomnies comme prétextes pour écarter un homme qu'il jugeait être un des partisans de Moreau.¹ On ne priva point Hugo de son emploi mais on ne le fit participer à aucune faveur.

Enfin une troisième chose survint qui, selon les *Mémoires* de Hugo (Vol. I, p. 101), aigrit encore davantage Napoléon contre lui. Lors de la conspiration (vraie ou fausse) contre le Premier Consul en 1802 on présenta des adresses contre Moreau où celui-ci était traité d'une manière outrageante. Et cela pour faire plaisir à Napoléon. On voulut faire signer Hugo, mais il refusa: "Je ne me refusai point à féliciter le 1^{er} Consul d'avoir échappé à une conspiration; mais je refusai ma signature à un écrit qui donnait à mon bienfaiteur plus d'une épithète odieuse. Ce refus ne fut pas ignoré du 1^{er} Consul" (Vol. I, p. 101).

Hugo fut envoyé à Marseille en 1804. Il était convaincu qu'il n'avait aucun espoir d'avancement et il envoya sa femme supplier Joseph Bonaparte de l'arracher de la 20^e demi-brigade. Pendant l'absence de Mme Hugo, il s'embarqua pour la Corse et quelques jours plus tard alla à l'île d'Elbe où Mme Hugo le rejoignit. Elle n'avait rien obtenu. De là, il alla à l'armée de l'Italie, 8^e corps de la Grande Armée, sous les ordres du Maréchal Masséna (1806). Il se trouva à la bataille de Caldiero (18 Brumaire, 1806), au succès de laquelle il contribua certainement. Là, dans l'obscurité, un général qu'il ne pouvait distinguer le questionna. Satisfait de ses réponses, il lui dit, "Bien, mon ami, vous serez colonel et officier de la Légion d'honneur." Il fut trois fois cité au rapport. Mais il ne fut pas nommé colonel. "Je savais que je n'aurais rien à prétendre tant que je ne me signalerais pas sous les ordres directs et sous les yeux mêmes de Napoléon," dit-il dans les *Mémoires* (Vol. I, p. 120). Il assista au passage du Tagliamento en 1806, lorsque l'armée allait

¹ Certainement Napoléon a montré son mécontentement à ceux qui sont restés fidèles à Moreau. La *Grande Encyclopédie* raconte ainsi le cas du général Dessolle: "Il tomba, pour avoir montré son attachement à Moreau, son ancien chef, dans la disgrâce de Bonaparte qui, devenu Empereur, l'éloigna systématiquement des grands commandements. Il servit obscurément en Espagne de 1808 à 1812."

vers Naples afin de conquérir ce royaume pour Joseph Bonaparte. A Rome, Hugo vit celui-ci et en fut bien accueilli. Il sollicita une place dans la garde française de Joseph; celui-ci l'y avait lui-même encouragé. Pourtant le général Saligny vint lui dire: "Le roi a pour vous beaucoup d'attachement et d'estime mais par des motifs qui ne vous sont point personnels il n'a pu vous admettre dans sa garde. Quand il en sera le maître il ne vous oubliera point" (*Mémoires*, Vol. I, p. 122).

Hugo donna sa démission. Il était à ce moment major dans l'armée française. Nous voyons donc qu'il *n'est pas Colonel quand il quitta l'armée de Napoléon—la Grande Armée.*

Puis il reçut de M. le comte Mathieu Dumas, ministre de la guerre, une invitation pressante de passer au service de Joseph. "Sa majesté," m'écrivait le ministre, "a des vues particulières sur vous, et veut vous donner très incessamment des preuves de sa confiance et de son estime" (*Mémoires*, Vol. I, p. 123). Hugo entra au service de Joseph en 1806, comme major. Il organisa un régiment pour aller contre Fradiavolo, le plus fameux "partisan" de l'Europe, qu'il réussit à prendre après beaucoup de peine.

Puis on le retrouve prenant part en qualité de major de Royal-Corse à une expédition dans la Pouille. En janvier 1808, Hugo fut chargé personnellement d'une autre expédition, aux sources de l'Ofanto. Six semaines après il reçut le brevet de Colonel de Royal-Corse et devint commandant d'Avellino.

Nommé maréchal du palais de S. M. il devint Commandeur de l'Ordre Royal. A ce moment-là Joseph fut appelé par Napoléon à régner sur l'Espagne et sur les Indes. Un mois après son départ il écrivit au colonel Hugo lui proposant d'aller le rejoindre. Hugo quitta Avellino pour se porter vers l'Espagne. Il partit avec regret. On pleurait en le voyant partir. "Sans le tendre sentiment de reconnaissance qui m'attachait au roi Joseph, *pour qui seul j'avais quitté le service de ma patrie* (nous employons l'italique), je n'aurais point quitté mes chers compagnons d'armes" (Vol. I, p. 186).

Hugo arriva en Espagne à la fin de juillet 1808. Il se trouvait à Burgos le 6 août 1808. Joseph n'ayant pu se maintenir à Madrid vint à Burgos, puis eut son quartier général à Vittoria où le colonel Hugo avait des fonctions à la cour. Il devait accompagner le roi.

En novembre de cette même année, Napoléon, avec la Grande Armée,¹ vint à l'aide de Joseph, et Hugo le vit pour la première fois. Il dit dans ses *Mémoires*: "Je voulus mieux voir l'homme extraordinaire qui, depuis si longtemps, fixait l'attention du monde entier; et pour cela, je me plaçai dans le grand salon (il y avait soirée chez Joseph en l'honneur de l'Empereur) parmi les officiers généraux et supérieurs de sa jeune garde; mais la manière brusque dont il les questionna, et l'œil sévère qu'il porta sur *mon uniforme étranger* (*celui de Royal-Corse*) me déterminèrent à me retirer sous peu, et je ne disparus pas sans plaisir à ses yeux trop souvent portés sur moi" (Vol. II, p. 18). Ici Hugo veut montrer que Napoléon ne regardait pas d'un œil amical ceux qui quittaient son armée. Le 2 décembre 1808 Napoléon arriva devant Madrid, attaqua la ville le 3, et y entra le 4. Le colonel Hugo fut plusieurs fois chargé par le roi Joseph de messages auprès de l'Empereur.

C'est à cette date, le 6 décembre 1808, que fut créé le régiment appelé Royal-Étranger dont le commandement fut offert par Joseph à Hugo.² Avec ce régiment le colonel Hugo eut l'ordre de marcher sur la province d'Avila pour y ramener l'ordre. Le 14 janvier 1809 il arriva à Avila. En juin sa mission était remplie, l'Empecinado, du reste, ayant quitté cette province pour les provinces voisines.

En juillet 1809 commença la retraite de l'armée française du Portugal où elle avait été battue par les Alliés (les Anglais surtout, sous Wellington). Avila étant sur la ligne de défense se trouva isolé et fit une résistance vigoureuse. Par Avila les deux parties de l'armée française pouvaient communiquer; d'où l'importance de cette place qui tint bon quoique Hugo n'ait eu que des soldats étrangers pour la défendre. Les Anglais se virent forcés à la retraite.

Hugo en récompense reçut de Joseph un million de réaux en cédules hypothécaires,³ et—voici ce qui nous intéresse—*le grade de*

¹ Il faut se rappeler que Napoléon a toujours eu une partie de sa Grande Armée en Espagne. Cette armée était française et sous les ordres de l'Empereur. Joseph aussi, sous ses ordres, avait une petite armée qui n'était pas française mais étrangère.

² Le Royal-Étranger était formé de prisonniers étrangers qui étaient devenus soldats de Joseph.

³ *Mémoires*, Vol. II, p. 156, note. Il dit: "Ce million en cédules hypothécaires n'ayant jamais pu être placé, resta et fut pris dans mon portefeuille à la bataille de Vittoria. Mes acquisitions en Espagne furent faites de mes propres deniers." Dufay dans son *V. Hugo à vingt ans* cite plusieurs lettres où le poète parle à son père des démarches faites pour recouvrer une partie au moins de la valeur de ces cédules hypothécaires; mais ces démarches restèrent sans résultat. Dufay ajoute: "le général était riche en cédules hypothécaires du roi Joseph, moins que des châteaux en Espagne" (p. 34).

maréchal de camp. Ce grade équivalait à celui de général de brigade.¹ C'est donc depuis ce jour-là qu'il eut droit à ce titre (dont son fils fait si grand cas) de général. C'était le 20 août 1809. Il était major-dome du palais depuis le mois de janvier. Un peu plus tard, il fut nommé inspecteur général de tous les corps formés et à former, et aussi Commandeur de l'Ordre Royal d'Espagne, dignité qui valait 30,000 réaux de rentes. Il était toujours à Avila et il y resta assiégé, lorsqu'en novembre 1809 eut lieu la grande bataille d'Ocaña entre les Français et les Alliés.

Napoléon mit alors la province d'Avila sous les ordres du maréchal duc d'Elchingen, et nomma le général Tilly gouverneur. Cela revenait à déplacer le général Hugo que Joseph envoya dans les provinces de Ségovie et de Soria (avril et mai 1810) comme gouverneur. Dans l'été de 1810, le général Hugo fut envoyé, comme gouverneur encore, dans la province de Guadalaxara. Là, il retrouvait son ancien ennemi l'Empecinado. Il guerroya contre lui jusqu'en 1811 sans résultat définitif. Le 27 septembre 1810, le roi Joseph l'ayant rencontré à Brihuega, lui avait offert au choix le titre de comte de Cifuentes ou comte de Siguenza, en récompense de ces campagnes. Il choisit celui de Comte de Siguenza.

Quelques mois plus tard, à cause de blessures qui l'inquiétaient beaucoup, il alla à Madrid où il devint chef d'état-major et puis commandant de la capitale des Espagnes.

Cependant le prestige de Napoléon s'affaiblissait. En Espagne le 12 août 1812, le roi Joseph se vit forcé de quitter Madrid pour quelque temps. Il l'abandonna définitivement le 27 mai 1813, emmenant à sa suite, sous les ordres de Hugo, un convoi de 300 voitures "où s'entassaient les ministres du roi, les conseillers d'État, les corps diplomatiques, les familles distinguées, etc." La fameuse bataille de Vittoria, le 21 juin 1813, priva définitivement Joseph de son royaume. Il rentra en France avec toute sa suite, et on se sépara pour toujours.

Voilà le "général Hugo" de retour en France. Qu'allait-il faire? Après le départ du roi Joseph chacun des généraux qui se

¹ Boursin et Challamel: *Dictionnaire de la Révolution française*: "Sous l'Ancien Régime les grades militaires étaient: officiers,—sous-lieutenant, lieutenant, colonel, adjudant général, maréchal de camp, lieutenant général, maréchal de France. En 1793 on supprima les maréchaux de camp et on remplaça le titre de colonel par celui de chef de brigade. Les lieutenants généraux changèrent leur titre pour celui de généraux et furent distingués par le titre de généraux de brigade et généraux de division."

trouvaient dans la même position que Hugo, c'est à dire qui n'appartenaient pas à l'armée française, reçut du ministre espagnol l'autorisation soit de quitter la vie militaire soit de rentrer dans l'armée française. Hugo sollicita du service dans l'armée de France où il fut réintégré avec le grade de major, fin de 1813.¹

Et, rentré dans l'armée française, c'est comme *major* (ou commandant) que Hugo reçut le 9 janvier 1814, l'ordre de se rendre à Thionville, où il organisa la défense qui dura jusqu'au 14 avril 1814; ce jour-là, le commandant Hugo apprit par des dépêches l'abdication de Napoléon. L'Empereur avait dit à Hugo à Thionville en 1814, qu'il le félicitait de sa conduite toute française et qu'il lui donnerait des preuves de sa satisfaction, mais les événements ne lui permirent pas de donner suite à sa promesse. Et le général Hugo ajoute dans ses *Mémoires* (Vol. III, pp. 181-82) qu' "il serait sorti général espagnol (ou major français) de la lutte nationale si l'extrême justice de sa majesté le roi Louis XVIII n'eût, en partie, réparé les torts de la fortune envers lui." Hugo avait commandé cette place, il l'avait défendue—

mais il n'avait qu'une commission de M. le Maréchal, duc de Valmy. Il n'avait point été confirmé dans son grade de général en France, quoique officier général depuis le 20 août 1809; et l'on assure que quand, le 12 septembre 1815, on lui envoya un successeur, la division (militaire) de la guerre qui fit le rapport ignorait qu'il y eût un général à Thionville. . . . Au reste, le roi Louis XVIII n'a pas voulu qu'une action aussi honorable que la défense de cette place appartint à un général étranger à son service et il a confirmé Hugo dans son grade de général à dater du 11 septembre 1813, époque où il était retourné en France.²

Napoléon revint en France en 1815.

Le général Hugo n'avait rien demandé à Napoléon; oublié par ce prince pendant la campagne de 1814, le général, rappelé par lui au service de la France, et qui ne devait son grade qu'à la demande du major-général des armées françaises . . . se retrouvait sans brevet, sans lettre de service pour la France, enfin dans la même position qu'à l'époque de la bataille de Vittoria (21 juin 1813), c'est à dire général *espagnol*, et aide-de-camp du prince Joseph

¹ "Je venais d'être nommé à ce grade en 1806 quand je passai au service de Naples; mais je ne le sus que bien longtemps après—c'est pourquoi j'acceptai alors le grade de chef de bataillon que j'avais depuis longtemps en France" (*Mémoires*, Vol. III, p. 180, note).

² Dufay, p. 15: "Tout en le mettant en demi-solde et loin de lui tenir rigueur, le roi lui avait auparavant accordé la croix de chevalier de l'ordre royal et militaire de Saint-Louis (1^{er} nov. 1814) et le grade de maréchal de camp des armées françaises (21 nov. 1814) pour prendre rang à la date de sa rentrée en France (11 sept. 1813). Quelques mois plus tard, le général était, ainsi qu'un de ses frères le Colonel Louis J. Hugo, promu par la même ordonnance au grade d'officier de la Légion d'Honneur."

Bonaparte; encore, pour remplir ce dernier emploi, lui eût-il fallu du ministère français des lettres de service qu'il ne reçut jamais.¹

Le 31 mars 1815, Hugo accepta de nouveau la défense de Thionville, qu'il quitta définitivement le 13 novembre de la même année, pour se retirer à Blois, où il écrivit ses *Mémoires* qui parurent le 4 octobre 1823, imprimés chez Ladvocat, Paris.²

Le 29 mai 1825, Charles X conféra au général Hugo le titre de lieutenant-général. Le 5 juin, le *Moniteur* annonçait: "M. le maréchal de camp Hugo vient d'être nommé Lieutenant-Général."³

Une attaque d'apoplexie l'enleva dans la nuit du 29 au 30 janvier 1828. Il avait été général *espagnol* sous Joseph Bonaparte. Il est devenu général *royaliste* sous la Restauration. Il n'a jamais été général de l'Empire.

Reste cependant une possibilité. Thierry dit (*op. cit.*, p. 7), "Parmi les généraux on trouve quelques soldats étrangers qui ont combattu dans nos rangs et qui se sont associés à nos gloires nationales." On pourrait donc dire: même si le général Hugo n'était pas général (ou colonel) de la République et de l'Empire, mais général de l'armée espagnole, il aurait pu avoir le droit de figurer à côté de ces étrangers.

Nous avons examiné ce point aussi. Avec les moyens à notre disposition il ne nous a pas été possible de retracer la carrière militaire de ces 652 généraux. Nous en avons 452, plus de deux tiers. Mais nos résultats même ainsi limités nous paraissent assez convaincants. Pour ces recherches nous nous sommes servi de Boursin et Challamel, Robinet, *Grande Encyclopédie*, et *Grand Dictionnaire Universel Larousse*.

Parmi ces généraux, il y a en effet plusieurs étrangers, et il semblerait à première vue qu'ils devraient avoir moins de droit de figurer sur l'Arc de Triomphe que le général Hugo. Leur cas est cependant différent du sien car, si Hugo, Français, avait obtenu son grade supérieur hors de France, eux, au contraire, étrangers, ont tous

¹ "Blocus et Défense de Thionville, Dierck et Rodermack en 1815." *Mémoires du Général Hugo*, Vol. III, p. 388. Note de cette même page: "Les nominations et les confirmations faites en 1814 par le général Dupont, ministre de la guerre de S. M. Louis XVIII, étaient en 1815 nulles aux yeux du ministre de Napoléon."

² Dufay cite une lettre de V. Hugo à l'éditeur des *Mémoires*, le priant de lui communiquer les feuilles "à mesure qu'elles sortent de presse." Sa femme désire les lire avant tout le monde et "désir de femme est un feu qui dévore."

³ *Ibid.*, p. 141.

obtenu leurs grades supérieurs sous *Napoléon*, en combattant pour la France sous le drapeau français. Prenons comme exemple le cas du général Dumonceaux (Jean-Baptiste), un Belge. A la tête d'un bataillon de Belges, il combattit avec les Français. En 1794 il fut nommé général de brigade et combattit sous Pichegru dans la fameuse campagne de Hollande qui se termina par la conquête de ce pays et la fondation de la République Batave. Nommé lieutenant général par cette République il devint commandant en chef des armées de son pays en 1805. La Hollande ayant été érigée en royaume pour Louis Bonaparte, Dumonceau devint commandant en chef des armées de ce prince. En 1807 il fut nommé Maréchal de Hollande. Napoléon le fit comte de l'Empire (impossible de trouver la date). Dumonceau était général de brigade sous Napoléon, et c'est dans la Grande Armée qu'il a obtenu son grade de général.

Voici maintenant qui nous rapproche plus du cas de Hugo et qui prouve, en outre que les Français qui se plaçaient sous les ordres de Joseph savaient à n'en pas douter, qu'ils perdaient leur rang d'officier français. Le général Lamarque (Jean-Maximin, comte Lamarque) devint général de brigade dans l'armée du Rhin en 1805, à Austerlitz, où il fut remarqué par l'Empereur qui l'envoya à l'armée chargée de conquérir le royaume de Naples. Lamarque y alla sous les armes françaises et s'empara de Gaëte; mais "il refusa le poste d'aide-de-camp de Joseph Bonaparte, roi de Naples, *pour conserver sa qualité de Français*" (Robinet). Il est à remarquer d'ailleurs, que même si Lamarque avait décidé de se mettre sous les ordres de Joseph à Naples, il avait été *général de brigade* sous Napoléon.

Maintenant, sur ces 452 généraux nous en avons cependant trouvé sept qui ont eu la même carrière militaire que Hugo sous Joseph Bonaparte à Naples ou en Espagne, ou sous Louis Bonaparte en Hollande. Ce sont: Lafon de Blaniac, Dedon-DuClos, Dumas, Compredon, Guye, Cavaignac, Caulaincourt. Leur cas est-il tout à fait le même que celui de Hugo?

Il résulte d'un examen minutieux de leur carrière¹ que ces sept officiers étaient colonels ou généraux avant de quitter l'armée de

¹ Le tableau de la carrière militaire de ces sept généraux n'est pas reproduit ici faute de place. On trouverait cette compilation et d'autres documents concernant notre publication à la bibliothèque de Smith Collège, département des manuscrits.

Napoléon et tous sont rentrés en France comme généraux dans cette même armée. Quant à Lafon de Blaniac, s'il a pris sa retraite dès son retour en France, il n'en avait pas moins été général sous Napoléon.

Nous avons trouvé cependant un cas qui pourrait être mis à côté de celui du général Hugo. C'est celui du général Jamin (Jean-Baptiste-Auguste-Marie). Voici sa carrière telle que la donne la *Grande Encyclopédie*:

Jamin devint chef d'escadron en 1802 et servit en Italie comme aide-de-camp de Masséna en 1805 et 1806. Colonel au service du roi Joseph à partir de cette dernière année, il fut élevé au grade de maréchal de camp en 1810 et, en 1811, fut nommé marquis de Bermuy. A la bataille de Vittoria (21 juin 1813), il commanda avec honneur les débris de la garde royale d'Espagne. Pendant la campagne de France, il devint *major* des grenadiers à cheval de la garde impériale (16 mars 1814). C'est comme *major* qu'il prit part à la bataille de Waterloo où il mourut, 18 juin 1815. [Signé A. Débidour.]

Robinet n'est pas d'accord avec la *Grande Encyclopédie*. Il dit de Jamin:

C'est en qualité de *général de brigade* qu'il fit les dernières campagnes de l'Empire. Il prit une part glorieuse à la bataille de Waterloo-Mont-Saint-Jean; il tomba héroïquement le 8 juin 1815.

Le *Grand Dictionnaire Universel Larousse* (article non signé) est plutôt d'accord avec la *Grande Encyclopédie*:

A la malheureuse bataille de Vittoria, Jamin se conduisit avec une bravoure qui l'a fait placer au rang de nos meilleurs généraux de cavalerie. De retour en France, il fit la campagne de 1814, fut nommé *major* des grenadiers à cheval de la garde impériale, continua à servir sous la Restauration, entra dans la garde impériale après le retour de Napoléon de l'Île d'Elbe et trouva la mort sur le champ de bataille de Waterloo.

Voilà mes trois autorités: entre elles, et surtout entre Robinet et la *Grande Encyclopédie* nous n'avons aucune raison péremptoire de décider. Il nous semble cependant que l'on serait en droit d'admettre que le titre de *major* des grenadiers de la garde impériale est un rang au moins équivalant au rang de général ordinaire, puisque Jamin, qui était un si excellent soldat, de général est devenu *major* des grenadiers de la garde impériale. Mais même si Jamin n'avait eu vraiment que le titre de *major* sous Napoléon, ce serait un cas exceptionnel et la réclamation de Victor Hugo ne devrait pas avoir pour

effet de faire ajouter le nom du *général royaliste* Hugo sur l'Arc de Triomphe, mais de faire rayer celui du *major impérial* Jamin.

Récapitulons :

Léopold-Sigisbert-Hugo n'était que major quand il quitta l'armée de Napoléon. C'est comme major qu'il entra dans l'armée de Joseph Bonaparte, *roi de Naples*. Il fut nommé alors colonel de Royal-Corse;¹ suivit le frère de Napoléon en Espagne, et là devint colonel de Royal-Étranger,² puis maréchal de camp (c'est à dire général de brigade) du même régiment. Il portait toujours l'uniforme étranger. Il devint gouverneur de trois provinces espagnoles (Avila, Ségovie, Guadalaxara) toujours sous Joseph et à la tête de régiments non français. Plus tard, il servit d'aide-de-camp du roi Joseph. Jamais Napoléon ne l'a reconnu comme maréchal de camp, autrement dit général de brigade; lorsqu'il revint en France (1813), il fut envoyé à Thionville comme simple major. Après sa première défense de Thionville (1814), Louis XVIII lui donna le titre de général français avec effet rétroactif, c'est à dire, à dater du 11 septembre 1813, époque où il était rentré en France.

Or, l'Arc de Triomphe de l'Étoile à Paris porte les noms des *généraux* de la Révolution et de l'Empire; nous n'avons trouvé que deux *colonels* dans les 452 que nous avons vérifiés. Dès lors, puisque Hugo ne réussit jamais à se faire reconnaître un grade plus élevé que celui de *major* dans l'armée de Napoléon, il n'avait pas droit à être inscrit sur l'Arc de Triomphe de l'Étoile et la réclamation de Victor Hugo n'est pas justifiée. Le fait qu'il ait fini par être reconnu général français sous Louis XVIII ne change rien à la question puisqu'il était alors général *royaliste*.

Et quant au cas du major *impérial* Jamin, il est plus que douteux que ce soit un cas identique. Et même s'il l'était, cela prouverait non pas qu'une injustice avait été commise à l'égard du général Hugo, mais qu'une faveur avait été faite à un autre.

ANNA ADÈLE CHENOT

SMITH COLLEGE

¹ Ce régiment était formé de prisonniers de toutes nationalités et portait un uniforme étranger.

² Régiment analogue à celui de Royal-Corse à Naples.

THE REDUPLICATION OF CONSONANTS IN VULGAR LATIN

It is a well-known fact that several Latin words sometimes appear with a single consonant, sometimes with a double one. Among the most typical instances are *cipus* and *cippus*, *cūpa* and *cuppa*, *pūpa* and *puppa*, *mūcus* and *muccus*. The reduplicated forms seem to have been much more numerous in Vulgar Latin, judging from what we find in Romance, where Fr. *bette*, *étoupe*, *chapon*, etc., point to VL *betta*, *stuppa*, *cappo* for *bēta*, *stūpa*, *cāpo*.

In his *Handbuch zur lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (pp. 290 ff.) Sommer devotes a few pages to the study of this very curious phenomenon. He gives up the task of distributing the examples into categories. He says that the conditions on which the phenomenon depends are unknown, though he believes in some influence of the accent. The cases of reduplication, he thinks, had been capriciously multiplied. They would rest, in the final analysis, on a shifting in the division of syllables.

The problem has thus never been seriously attacked, and the explanations have been necessarily of a provisional character. The purpose of this article is to try to make a classification of the cases of reduplication, and by a closer consideration of them to throw some light on the phenomenon.

Schulze (*Lateinische Eigennamen*, p. 520) has already pointed out the great number of *gentilicia* and *cognomina* which appear with double consonants, as: *Allius*, *Arrius*, *Attius*, *Babbius*, *Lappus*, *Cottus*, *Cattus*, *Ninno*, *Occus*, etc. Sommer also mentions *Varro*, *Gracchus*, *Agrippa*, *Mummius*, etc. Some of these names are derived from children's words, as *Attius*, *Babbius*, *Ninno*, *Mummius*; some are abbreviations or alterations as *Varro* (*vārus*) *Gracchus* (< *gracilis* "slender"). The process seems to be Indo-European, judging (1) from Greek names, as *Στράττις* for *Στράτιππος*, *Κλεόμμυς* for *Κλεομένης*, *Μεννέας* for *Μενεκράτης*, *Φιλλέας* for *Φιλόξενος*, etc., and (2) more still from Teutonic short-names such as *Sicco* (*Siegfried*), *Itta*,

(*Itaberga*), *Okko*, *Ukko*, *Juppo*, *Sotto*, *Otto*, *Batto*, etc.—names which survive, for instance, in the Belgian village-names: *Sichem*, *Itegem*, *Okkerzeel*, *Uccle*, *Jupille*, *Sothegeem*, *Ottignies*, *Bettegem*, etc.

Along with these proper names in Latin should be mentioned a great many epithets eminently susceptible of being applied to people, often with some depreciation or irony. From *vārus* "curved" is derived *Varro*, well known as the cognomen of the celebrated grammarian. The glossaries mention *vorri* "edaces," while *cūppes* in Plautus is a "lickery tongue," a "greedy man," both being familiar formations from *voro* and *cupio*; *lippus* "blear-eyed" is for *leipos* (cf. Gr. λίπος "fat"); *mattus* "humid," "intoxicated" is for *mātus*; *suppus* "lying on the back, indolent" is a variation of *supīnus*; *bruttus* (It. *brutto*, Fr. *brute*) has replaced *brūtus* "brute," "senseless"; *glutto* "glutton" (It. *ghiottone*, Fr. *glouton*) for *gluto* is akin to *glutus* "abyss," *gula* "mouth"; *cloppus* "halt" is said to be a corruption of *χολόπους*, while an usurer was humorously called *succo* "a sucker," from *sūcus*.

It will be observed that all these appellatives are familiar and ironical. The process of abbreviation used with proper names very naturally also applies here, since *vorrus*, *cūppes*, *mattus*, *suppus* very clearly are shortened forms of *vorax*, *cupidus*, *madidus*, *supīnus*. Of an eminently appellative character also are the "Lallwörter," or baby-words. They are nearly the same in all languages, and at times are introduced from the nursery language into the regular speech.

Among them may be mentioned in Latin:

ATTA "father" (hence the gentile *Attius*).

PAPPUS "old man," and by metaphor "beard of thistle."

BABBUS "father" (Sard. *babbu*, It. *babbo*).

AMMA "mother" (hence *Ammius*), surviving in Sp., Port. *ama* and in the diminutive *amita* "aunt" (O.Fr. *ante*); *amma* in Latin was also by irony an "owl."

MAMMA "mother" (It. *mamma*, Fr. *maman*, etc.), properly "breast"; meaning preserved in the diminutive *mammilla*.

ANNA "old woman," beside *ānus* (hence the gentile *Annaeus*, *Annius*), is found in the name of the goddess; *Anna Perenna* (Varro *Sat. Men. Frag.* 506. Buech.).

ACCA in *Acca Larentia* "mother of the Lares" is an old "Lallwort"; cf. Skr. *akkā* "mother," Gr. *Ἀκκω* (Demeter).

NANNA, NONNA "old woman" (It. *nonna* "grandmother," Fr. *nonne* "nun," Sp. *nana* "housewife").

*NINNUS "child," apophonic variation of the preceding word (Sp. *niño* "child," It. *ninnolo* "toy").

PUTTUS "boy," beside *pūtus*, is akin to Lat. *puer*, Skr. *putra*. It has undergone the same reduplication as the older familiar appellatives, hence O.It. *putta* "boy," *putta* "lass," Fr. *pute*, *putain* "prostitute."

PUPPA "little girl," "doll" (Fr. *poupée* "doll," *poupon* "baby," O.It. *poppina* "pupil," "eye"), beside *pūpus*, *pūpa* "baby"; *puppa* also meant "teat" (It. *poppa* "breast"), and is an onomatopoea.

*(PITTUS) *PITTITUS, *PITTINUS, *PITTICUS "small" (Mil. *pitin*, Sard. *pīlicu*, Fr. *petit*, etc.).

*PICCUS, *PICCINUS, *PICCOCCUS, *PICCULUS "small" (Calabr. *picca* "little bit," Rum. *piciu* "child," It. *piccolo* "small," Sard. *piccinu*, *picciocu* "small").

MICCUS "small" (Rum. *mic* "little," Calabr. *miccu* "small") is a variation of *piccus* under the influence of *mica* and Gr. *μικρός*.

The suffixes -ITTUS, -ATTUS, -OTTUS, and -ICCUS, -ACCUS, -OCCUS are found first in proper names of women: *Julitta*, *Livitta*, *Galitta*, *Suavitta*, *Caritta*, *Bonitta* or *Bonica*, *Carica* (Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung*, pp. 184, 185). Irrespective of their origins, we may consider them thus as endings for affectionate appellatives.

Besides these "Lallwörter" a great many "Schallwörter" (onomatopoeas) show the same reduplication. We find it, for instance, in a long series of familiar words referring to parts or functions of the body, such as:

BUCCA "swollen cheeks," "mouth" (It. *bocca*, Fr. *bouche* "mouth," Pr. *bocco* "lip").

*BICCUS "beak" (Sard. *biccu*, It. *becco*), diminutive variation of *bucca* under the influence of a Celtic word.

MUCCUS for MŪCUS "mucus," *muccare* "to wipe one's nose" (Sard. *muccu*, It. *moccio*, *mocciolo*, *moccicone* "snotty child," Fr. *moucher*, etc.).

*MURRUS "snout" (Sard. *murru*, Sp. *morro* "protruding lip").

GUTTUR "throat," doubtfully related to Eng. *cut* by Ehrlich (Walde, p. 870), appears to be a mere onomatopoea: *guttus* "jar with narrow opening" seems to be connected with *guttur* and suggests the same impression of strangling or choking.

GLUTTIRE "to swallow" is akin to *glūto* "glutton" (cf. *supra*), but it has been felt as an onomatopoea.

MUTTIRE "to mutter," *muttum* "mutter, word" (Fr. *mot*) is also suggestive of a dull noise.

*TITTA "teat," sometimes held to be Teutonic, is an imitative word like *puppa* "teat" (cf. *supra*).

*CINNUM "wink," *cinnare* "to wink" (It. *cenno*, Sp. *ceño*) is hardly the same word as Gr. *κίκρυρος* "lock of hair." It appears to be an imitative word with the childlike ending *-innus* of *pisinnus*, *pitinnus* "small," *pipinna* "parva mentula," etc.

*POTTA "thick lip" (Fr. dial. *potte* "lip," It. *potta* "cunnus").

*PATTA "paw" refers to a thick, flat foot (Fr. *patte* "paw," *pataud* "dog with large paws," *patauger* "to dabble," *patouiller* "to muddle," etc.).

PUPPIS, "stern of a ship" is mentioned here because, according to Walde (p. 623), it is a familiar derivation from *pu-* "back," "behind," cf. Skr. *puta-* "buttock," "rump."

A series of words of this kind referring to blowing, swelling, and inconsistency, all have *ff* as the characteristic sound:

*LOFFA "wind," "fart" (It. *loffia*, Cat. *lufa* "fart," "whore," It. *loffio* "slack").

*BAFFA "paunch" (Piem. *bafra* "full belly," Fr. *bafre* "gluttony," Engad. *baffa* "flitch of bacon").

*BAFFIARE "to jeer" (properly "to swell the cheeks in mockery") (Prov. *bafa* "mockery," Abbruz. *abbafa* "to mock").

*BEFFARE "to mock" (It. *beffa* "mockery," Sp. *befo* "lower lip of a horse").

*BIFFARE "to make a quick movement" (Fr. *biffer* "to wipe off," *se rebiffer* "to bristle up").

*BUFFARE "to blow with full cheeks" (It. *buffo* "blast of wind," *buffare* "to play the buffoon," *buffa* "drollery").

*MUFFARE "to swell one's cheeks," "to mock" (Sp. *mofa* "mockery, disdain," Engad. *mofla* "swollen cheeks," It. *camuffare* "to muffle up").

*EX-BRUFFARE "to gulp," "to gush forth" refers like *biffare* to quick movements (Fr. *s'esbrouffer*).

*CIOFFUS, CIAFFUS "stout," "swollen," "silly" (O.It. *ciofo* "mean individual," Istr. *ciubo* "stout man").

More directly imitative are:

*RUSSARE "to snore" (It. *russare*).

*PISSIARE "to urinate" (It. *pisciare*, Fr. *pisser*, It. *pisciarello* "light wine").

SCUPPIRE "to spit" (Sp. *escupir*).

*CRACCARE "to spit noisily" (Fr. *cracher*, It. *scharacchiare*).

*CECCARE "to stammer" (Sic. *kekku* "stutterer," Bellun. *kekiñar* "to stammer").

*CIOCCARE "to suck" (It. *cioccare*).

*HUCCARE "to shout" (Prov. *ucar*, Fr. *hucher*).

*HIPPAR "to sob" (Sp. *hipar*); cf. *hippitare*, CGIL, V, 601, 18.

*LAPPARE "to lick" (Fr. *laper*, *lamper*). Perhaps Teutonic.

PAPPARE "to eat" (It. *pappare*, Wall. "pap," "soup"), a children's word comparable with Germ. *pappen*. Cf. *puppa* "teat."

*CIOCCIARE "to suck" (It. *ciocciare*, Fr. *sucer*, dial. *chucher*, Sp. *chuchar*).

*CIARRARE "to chat" (Prov. *charrar*, Norm. *charer*, Prov. *charade*, It. *ciarlare*, Sp. *charlar*, contaminated with *parabolare*).

BLATTIRE "to babble" (Pauli, KZ, XVIII, 3), rhyming with *muttire* "to mutter."

*BATTARE and BATARE "to gape" (Walde, p. 81).

*CATILLARE "to tickle" (Fr. *chatouiller*, Prov. *gatilhar*, contaminated with *cattus* "cat").

*PRILLARE, PIRLARE "to be thrilling," "to whirl," etc. (It. *prillare*, Friul. *pirrarse* "to be impatient," Port. *pilrete* "dwarf," O.It. *brillare dalla gioia* "to be thrilling," "radiant with joy").

The movements of lips, which we have seen to be so expressive of mockery in *buffare*, *baffare*, *muffa*, etc., are also suggestive of thickness and rotundity and therefore are used for clods, lumps, etc. Beside **potta* "thick lip" and **patta* "thick, flat foot," for instance,

existed **motta* and **matta* for clods of earth, of milk, etc. Cf. Franc-Comtois *motte* "clod of butter," Sp. *mota* "knot in a cloth," Lomb. *motta* "thick lip" (= *potta*), Fr. *motte* "clod of earth" (Eng. *moat*), while *matta* gives Fr. *matte* "junket," *maton* "pancake," Sic. *matta* "group," etc. **ciotta* and **ciatta* have the same meaning (Rum. *ciot* "knotty excrescency," It. *ciottolo* "pebble," Fr. *sot* "silly," Lomb. *ciat* "toad," *ciot* "child," etc.). **bottia* "hump," "bump," perhaps akin to *botulus*, *botellus*, "bowel" is rhyming with *motta*, etc. (Fr. *bosse*, It. *bozza* "bump," Rum. *bot* "clod"). One has finally: **multus* "blunted" (Engad. *muot* "hornless," Lyon. *moto* "to cut off the branches of a tree."

The relation between **motta* and a thick lip is emphasized, not only by the fact that **motta* "clod" means "thick lip" in Northern Italy, but by the existence for **murrum* "snout" of both the meaning "protruding lip" (Sp. *morro*) and "pebble, rock" (Sp. *morro*, Piazz. *murra*). Other words referring to humps also show the reduplication, as *gibbus* and *gubbus*. According to Walde (p. 340), the word would be akin to Lett. *gibbis* "hump-backed." The *bb* is thus perhaps old. In *bulla* "bubble" *ll* seems to be Latin. Though the word may be old (cf. Lith. *bulis* "buttock," *burbulas* "bubble"), its onomatopoeic value was certainly quite clear to the minds of the Romans. As to *offa* "bit," "clod of meal," it is most likely for *odbha* (Cymr. *oddf* "hump," M.Ir. *odb* "bone").

The disagreeable impression made on our senses by rough, knotty, and thorny substances is rendered in all languages by syllables containing gutturals with *r*. We may thus reasonably register as onomatopoeas a series of words of obscure origin referring to rocks or points and exhibiting the reduplication so frequent in all Latin spontaneous creations:

**CRAPPA* "piece of rock" (Engad. *crap*, Lomb. *crapa* "rock," Judic. *grapa* "skull").

**GREPPUM* "rock" (It. *greppo* "protruding rock," Obwald. *grip* "cliff").

Both these are onomatopoeas comparable with Du. *krabben* "to scratch."

**ROCCA* "rock" (It., Sard. *rocca*, Fr. *roche*).

**FROCCUS* "rough, uncultivated land" (O.Fr. *froc*, Span. *lleco*).

***BROCCUS** "with protruding teeth," also of unknown origin (Walde, p. 97); unless it is Celtic, it is certainly onomatopoeic (It. *brocco* "pointed stick," Nap. *vrocca* "fork," Prov. *broc* "thorn").

***BRUCCUS** (Gloss. 628, 42; Meyer-Lübke, *Wiener Studien*, XXV, 93) is a contamination between *broccus*, *froccus*, and *brūca* "heath," a Celtic word (Ir. *froech*).

To these words of sensation may be added *hitta* or *hetta* "trifle" that has undergone the influence of **pittus* "small," -*ittus*, **pitittus*, etc., and **citto* for *cito* "quick, soon" from *cieo* "to move," that seems to have reduplicated its *t* by an assimilation of short time to short space.

***FULAPPA**, ***FULUPPA** "fibre," "straw," a mysterious word of great extension in Vulgar Latin, most probably also is an imitative word of the same order as Eng. *flap*, *flip*, *flippant*, referring to things light and inconsistent. It is used of straw and rods; It. *frappa* "arbor," *frappare* "to adorn, to tell lies," Fr. *frapouille*, *fripouille* "bag of rags," Lomb. *faloppa* "silk-cocoon," It. *viluppo* "bundle," Fr. *envelopper* "to wrap," etc. It is perhaps this *faluppa*, inasmuch as it refers to bundles and fetters, which has influenced:

***MARSUPPA** (Gr. *μάρσιπος*) "bag" for *marsupium* (Sp. *marsopa* "porpoise").

***STUPPA** (Gr. *στύπη*) "raw flax" for *stūpa* (It. *stoppa*, Fr. *étoupe*).

***CRUPPA** "thick rope" (*CGIL*, 118, 16) (It. *groppo*) (Teutonic?).

Though the term "onomatopoea" well applies to most of these formations, it would be used with even more propriety of the following words which directly imitate noises:

***PICCARE** "to prick" (It. *piccare*, Fr. *piquer*, Sp. *picar* "to itch," Sp. *pico* "beak," It. *picco* "point, top," Cat. *picot* "woodpecker").

***TICCARE** "to tap with a point," "to mark" (It. *tecco* "spot," Fr. *enticher* "to infect").

***TACCARE** "to touch," "to mark" (Fr. *tacher* "to soil," It. *tacca* "notch," *attaccare* "to fasten," Sp. *taco* "peg").

***TUCCARE** "to knock," "to touch" (It. *toccare*, Fr. *toucher*).

***SCLOPPUS** "noise made by striking the swollen cheeks."

GUTTA "drop" has no satisfactory etymology. It seems to refer to the noise of dripping water and is indeed in assonance with *guttur*, *gluttio*, referring to similar sounds.

*JUTTA "soup" (Parm. *dzota*, Engad. *giuota*, Friul. *yote*) seems to be a creation of the same order.

A great many imitative words refer to the sounds and noises produced by animals:

PIPPARE, PIPITARE "to peep," "to chirp" is an onomatopoea found in practically all languages: Gr. *πιπιῖω*, Germ. *piepen*, etc. (Fr. *piper*, It. *pipa* "pipe," Fr. *pipeau* "shepherd's pipe").

*BURRIRE "to hunt" (properly "to rouse hares and partridges by shouting *brrr*") (It. dial. *burir* "to hunt," Fr. *bourrer* "to chase game," Prov. *burra* "to excite the dogs").

The stammering and muttering of the stutterer and idiot are expressed by similar sounds: Lat. *baburrus* "stultus, ineptus," Lat. *burrae* "drollery."

*MURRUM "snout" also rhymes with these words.

*GORRUM "hog" is, of course, of the same family (O.Fr. *gorre*, *gorron*, Sp. *gorrin* "hog").

GLATTIRE "to bark," "to yelp" (It. *ghiattire*, Sp. *latir*).

GRACCITARE is said of geese, *graccilare*, of the chickens, *garrio* "to chatter," "to babble," of frogs, birds, and men.

*CIUTTUS "lamb" (Engad. *ciotin* "lamb," Obwald. *ciut* "lamb") (Meyer-Lübke, p. 195).

*MUCCA "cow" (It. *mucca* "cow," Romagnol. *moca*).

*GUCCIUS "dog" (O.It. *cuccio*, O.Fr. *gous*, Sp. *gozque*).

*CUCCIUS "pig" (Rum. *cucciu*, Fr. *cochon*, Sp. *cocho*).

ACCEIA "snipe" (O.It. *accegja*, Sp. *arcea*).

CUCULLUS, *CUCCUS "cuckoo" instead of *cululus*.

In this way, a great many animals had names with double consonants because those names were imitative. Other names of animals exhibited the same peculiarity for another reason. It was because they were used as familiar appellatives.

VACCA "cow," compared with Skr. *vāṣa* "cow," *vāṣati* "bellows," is clearly a Latin reduplication.

*MARRO "ram" (Gasc. *marru*, Sp. *marron*) is a familiar derivative from *mas*, *maris* "male."

CAPPO for *capo* "capon." The *p*-form only survives in Sard. *caboni* "cock." The other Romance forms go back to *cappo*: It. *cappone*, Fr. *chapon*.

PULLUS "young animal," if it is akin to Greek πῶλος "colt," Goth. *fula* "foal," is reduplicated for *pūlos*, but it could be for *pulos* (Walde, p. 623).

VAPPO "moth," though it cannot be an appellative, is, however, a familiar formation, apparently akin to *vapor* (Walde, p. 807).

CATTUS "cat," first found in Martial (Walde, p. 141), is generally held to be Celtic. One could also consider it as a "Rückbildung" from *catulus*, *catellus*. The *tt* also exists in Celtic: *kattos*.

DRACCO for *draco* (Gr. δράκων) is mentioned in the *Appendix Probi*.

Three new names of fish end in *-otta* and may have been influenced by one another:

*PLOTTA "flatfish" (Lomb. *piota*, Engad. *plotra*) is a Greek word (τὰ πλωτά "migratory fish"), the meaning of which has been contaminated by *plattus* "flat."

*ROTTA "roach."

*LOTTA "lote" for *lota*. The name is special to Gaul.

Finally one could mention, though it is of a very doubtful etymology:

*SAPPUS "toad" (Sp. *sapo*, Port. *sapar* "marsh," Lorr. *sevet* "tree-frog"). The word is perhaps Celtic and akin to *sappos* "resinous tree." The toad would be "the sappy." With the same meaning, it could be Latin and be considered as an abbreviation of **sapidus* from *sapa* "juice of fruit" (cf. *suppus* from *supinus*, *vorrus* from *vorax*, etc.).

Though plant-names can hardly be used as appellatives, they at times appear with double consonant. One has always to do with familiar, popular names and mostly with abbreviations of the type of *sappus* if our explanation of that word be right.

VITTA "string" is properly a "wicker-twist." A comparison with Gr. *τέτα* "willow," *ἴκτος* "wicker," O.Pruss. *witwan* "willow" tends to show that *vitta* is for *vitva*. The *tt* has thus here regularly arisen from *tv*.

*BETTA "beat" for an older *bēta* preserved in Sard. *peda*. *beta* survives in Fr. *bette*, Milan. *erbeta*. The latter form, obviously contaminated by **herbitta*, shows that the reduplication is likely to have arisen through the influence of *-itta*.

*BLITTA (Fr. *blette*) "blite" is the form of *blitum* in Gaul under the influence of the very kindred plant: *betta* "beet."

VACCINIUM "cranberry," "huckleberry" is in some relation to Gr. *δάκνθος*, that has the same meaning. A contamination is thus probable with *vacca*, *vaccinum*. It is "grape for cows" just in the same way as an Alpine cranberry is "grape for bears" (*uva ursi*).

LAPPA "burdock" is compared by Walde (p. 412) with Gr. *λάπαθος* "sorrel." Both plants have similar broad, crisp leaves. The relation is obscure; *lappa* is perhaps an abbreviation.

CRACCA "blue vetch" is still more likely to be an abbreviation. It is compared by Pauli (KZ, XVIII, 3) with *cracens* "gracilis." The etymology very well suits the aspect of the plant.

LACCA (Apul.), LACCAR (Plin.) (Walde, p. 403), name of some plant, is possibly abbreviated from *lacera* "jagged." Cf. Gr. *λάκος*, *lakis* "rag." This *lacca* is apparently different from *lacca* "swelling in the muscles of horses" which possibly is an abbreviation of *lacertus* "muscle" (Walde, p. 483).

*SAPPINUM, *SAPPIUM "spruce" (O.It. *zappino*, Fr. *sapin*). The word could be derived from *sapa* "sap, syrup." The spruce would be the "sappy, resinous tree." *sapa* has produced in the same way: *sabina* "savin" and *sabucus* (O.Fr. *seū*, Prov. *savuc*, Rum. *soc*) "eldertree" (= *sambucus*). The contamination with a Celtic word has, however, acted in the same manner as with *cattus* (cf. *supra*). Celt. *sapos* "fir" is preserved in O.Fr. *sapoie* "forest of firs" and in the name of the *Savoie* (= *Sapaudia*; cf. Cymr. *sybwydd* "fir"). This Gaulish name is also etymologically related to resin (cf. Lett. *sweki* "resin," Lith. *sakai* "id," O.Sl. *soka* "sap").

*SUCCA "stem" (Fr. *souche*, Prov., Cat. *soca*) is very obscure in its origins. Is it an abbreviation of *succidus*, *sucidus* "juicy," and is this word a formation similar to **sappus*, **sappinus*, meaning: "sappy, wellgrown, strong wood"?

*GURRA "willow" (It. *gorra*, Sic. *agurra*, Prov. *goret*) of unknown origin; possibly a popular adulteration of *gyrus* "circle," in the same way as in Greek, *tréa* is a "willow" while *trus* is a "circle made out of willow-wood, a felly" (Boisacq, *Dict.*, p. 386).

*MARRO "chestnut" (It. *marrone*) is obscure; may be borrowed from some language unknown.

*BETTULA, *BETTUS: BETULA "birch" is Celtic (Cymr. *bedw* "birch"). The *tt*-forms are preserved in O.Fr. *betole*, Prov. *bez* (*bettus*).

BACCA beside *bāca* "berry" (Fr. *baie* "berry," Sp. *baga* "integument of flax-seed," *baya* "husk," Gallic *bago* "grape"). The word is probably in origin identical, or at least kindred, with *Bacchus* "god of wine" and has meant "grape" (Walde, p. 80). It also means "grape" in Latin and has preserved that meaning in several derivatives, so that, at any rate, a secondary association with *Bacchus* is certain. Among the derivatives some have *c*: *bacara* (Sic. *bacara* "pitcher"), **baciola* (It. *bagiola* "huckleberry"), **bacula* (It. *bagola* "fruit of the lote-tree"); some have *cc*: **bacellum* "husk" (It. *bacello*), *baccinum* "basin" (It. *bacino*, Fr. *bassin*, Prov. *baci*), *baccile* (It. *bacile* "basin"), etc. From *baccinum*, by "Rückbildung," have been formed in Gaul: **bacca* "receptacle for water" (Fr. *baché*) and **baccus* "trough" (Fr. *bac*). This formation is parallel to that of **cattia* "mason's trowel," from *catinus* "dish."

*POTTUS, the ancestor of Fr. *pot*, possibly has a similar history. One finds in Venantius Fortunatus (Meyer-Lübke, 6705) *potus* with that meaning, so that *pottus* may be a familiar metonymy, but more probably is an abbreviation of *potatorium* (vas), *potilis* (nidus).

The application of this reduplication to names of plants and of utensils of daily use, as *baccinum*, *baccus*, *cattia*, is accounted for by the familiar, somewhat peasant-like character of this process. It is observable in a few more words referring to objects and utensils connected with farming. Some are Latin, as:

FLOCCES for FLŌCES (Walde, p. 300), "dregs of wine," perhaps akin to Lith. *žlauktai* "husks" (W. Meyer, *KZ*, XXVIII, 174) but certainly contaminated with *flaccus*, *floccus* (cf. *supra*).

VAPPA "moldy wine" is most probably an abbreviation of *vapidus* "moldy."

CUPPA: *cūpa*. The older form: *cūpa* (Skr. *kūpa* "cave," Gr. *κύπη*) has been preserved with the original meaning (kieve, tub) in Fr. *cuve*, Sp. *cuba*, It. *cupo* "deep," but a very interesting process of differentiation has resulted in giving to the reduplicated form *cuppa* the meaning of "cup" (It. *coppa*, Rum. *cupa*, Fr. *coupe*).

It should, moreover, be mentioned that double consonants are found in a few names of cloths, instruments, etc., of foreign origin,

though it is often difficult to tell whether the reduplication is Latin or exotic. This is the case, e.g., with *soccus* "plowshare," a Celtic word, which has been made to rhyme with *broccus*, *occa*, etc.

MATTEA (It. *mazza*, Fr. *masse*) and MATTEUCA "club" (Fr. *massue*) are probably akin to *mattaris*, of Celtic origin.

MARRA "axe" is Semitic (Assyr. *marru* "axe").

*BARRA "bar," common to all Romance languages, is of unknown origin, but I wonder whether it also could not be in some manner traced back to Semitic (Hebr. *barzel* "iron," Assyr. *parzilla*, from which Eng. *brass* and Lat. *ferrum* are supposed to have come) (Walde, p. 285) ?

SACCUS "bag" (Hebr., Phen. *saq* "hairy cloth").

SOCCUS "light shoe," "sock" (It. *socco*, Sp. *zueco*) is Phrygian (cf. Avest. *hakha* "sole").

MAPPA "map" is Punic.

MATTA "mat," probably also Punic (Hebr. *mitthâh* "cover").

DRAPPUM "cloth" appears pretty late and is of unknown origin.

BIRRUS "hood," BURRA "hairy cloth" are perhaps Macedonian (Walde, p. 91).

BUTTIS, *BUTTICULA "cask, bottle" (It. *botte*, Fr. *bouteille*, etc.) have come through Greek, but are probably also of Eastern origin.

*BOCCALIS for BAUCALIS (Gr. *βαυκαλῖς*) has no clear connection in Greek (It. *boccale* "flask"). Here the *cc* is due to contaminations. Sard. *broccale* has been influenced by *broccus*, while *bucca*, *bacca* are other possible associations.

TUCCA "κατάλυμα ζωμοῦ" is Celtic, and perhaps an abbreviation of *tuccetum*, *tuccinum* "bacon" (Cat. *locin*, Sp. *locino* "lard").

The reduplication of consonants finally is observable in a few words which are not susceptible of classification. Most of them have a familiar character:

CAPPA "mantle" or "cap" (It. *cappa*, Fr. *chappe*, *chaperon*) is, according to Thurneysen (Walde, p. 128), an abbreviation of *capitulare*, *capital*, etc.

*PANNUS "rag," "cloth" (Sp. *pañó*, It. *panno*, Fr. *pan*) is for *pānus*; cf. Goth. *fana* "sweating-cloth," OHG *fano* "cloth."

*CLOPPA for *copula* "pair" (Nap. *kyoppa*, Ven. *ciopa*) is a metathesis of the same kind as **clinga* for *cingula*, **padule* for *palude*,

**ligita* for *litiga*, **cofaccia* for *focacea*, **plūpo* for *populus*, **piclare* for *plicare*, **porcacla* for *portulaca*, **sudicius* for *sucidus*, etc. The double *p* may have been developed in the primitive form: *copplia*, as is always the case in Italy before palatal *l*.

LITTERA: *littera* is a word of doubtful origin. The *tt* is, in this word, universal in Romance: It. *lettera*, Sard. *littera*, Fr. *lettre*, etc.

LITTUS: *litus* "shore." This word has no other representative in Romance than It. *lido* from *litus*. It is thus doubtful whether the *tt* found in some manuscripts ever was a popular pronunciation. The original form, of course, was *litus* for *leitos*; cf. Ir. *Letha* "shoreland," Lat. *Latium*, Lith. *Letūwa* "Lithuania," etc.

MITTO "I send." The etymology is not quite sure. One compares it with Avest. *maeth* "send," and Eng. *smite*. If so, it is for *meito*. The *tt*, however, must be very old in this word, which it is true, had a somewhat popular character as shown by its great extension in Romance (at the expense of *ponere*, *locare*, etc.).

NARRO "I tell" is more decidedly familiar. It is, of course, for *gnāro*. It means "to acquaint with," "to make known," and was freely used as a familiar substitute for *dicere*, before *fabulare* and *parabolare* in succession usurped that position (cf. Sard. *narrere* "to tell, to say").

STRENNA (It. *strenna*) instead of *strēna* (Sic. *strina*, Sard. *istrina*) is assumed to be a Sabinian word akin to *strenuus*. The *nn* may be due to the existence of a "Nebenform" in which *-nua* had evolved into *-nna*.

TOTTUS: *tōtus*. The *tt*-form is recent. Spanish preserves *totus* in Sp. *todo*. *tottus* mentioned by Consentius (V, 392, Keil) survives in Fr. *tout*, while It. *tutto*, O.Fr. *tuit* point to **tuctus*, perhaps by contamination with *cunctus* (Grandgent, *Introd. to VL*, § 204).

HOCC ERAT: *hoc erat*. According to Velleius Longus and Pompeius, both these pronunciations were in use. Sard. *occanno* (*hoc anno*) seems to indicate that the former was the really popular one.

-ESSIS for *-ensis* (= *-esis*) is condemned in the *Appendix Probi* (*capseis* non *capsesis*). It is found sporadically in inscriptions: *Decatessium*, CIL, X, 1695, and in the Put. MS of Livy, xxix. 6. 4; xxx. 4. 6: *Locresses*, *Carthaginesses*. Apparently, we have here to do with an occasional compromise between the current pronunciation *-esis* and the pedantic one *-ensis*.

*BASSUS "low," a decidedly popular formation for **bassius* from Greek *βάσις* "bottom," also presents a double ss (It. *basso*, Fr. *bas*). It is due to the pre-existence of **bassius*, **bassiare* (Nap. *vasciare*, Sp. *bajar*, Sard. *basciu*, Sic. *vasciu*) in which *s* has been reduplicated under the influence of the *i* in hiatus.

POSSUIT, POSSIT, POSSIVIT (= *posuit*), found in many inscriptions, e.g., in *CIL*, II, 2661, 2712, 5736, 5738, is perhaps a dialectal form of *posuit* in which the *r* of the prefix *por-* (**por-sivit*) has produced a *ss*, in the same way as *sursum* was pronounced **sussum*.

In all the cases mentioned thus far, excepting **cloppa*, **bassus*, and perhaps *strenna*, the reduplication appears to be independent of the sounds adjoining the consonant concerned. In Italian, on the contrary, as is well known, the reduplication in a great many cases is due to the influence of a following *y*, *w*, *r*, *l*. This process should be sharply distinguished from the phenomenon of which this article is treating. Its origins, however, are remote and are to be found in the tendencies that were active in the language of the people of Italy in Roman times: *acqua* for *aqua*, for instance, is found already in the *Appendix Probi*, and Heraeus (*ALL*, II, 318) mentions forms like *ecquitum*, *atque* (for *aquae*) and *nuncquam* in MSS. *Acqua* instead of *aqua* explains many Romance forms of that word, also outside of Italy (cf. C. Huebschmann, *Die Entstehung von aqua in Romanischen*). *Quattuor* also is common to all Romance languages. The reduplication in *battuere* "to beat" is also ancient. The word is familiar. Johanson explains it as a contamination of *batuere* with **battere*, but the reduplication was to be expected there in any case.

Reduplications before *y* are also sometimes ancient and common to various Romance languages, as, e.g., in *bracchium* (Fr. *bras*, *brasse*, Sard. *rattu*, etc.), *plattea* (Fr. *place*). Moreover, *socius* is found in inscriptions (*CIL*, V, 4410; VI, 6874). Hesitations in the treatment of *sy* in Italian also point to the existence of *ssy* beside *sy* in VL. One has indeed *basium* "kiss" and *caseus* "cheese," giving *bascio* and *cascio*, while *cerasea*, *cinisia*, *piseat* produced *cilegia*, *cinigia*, *pigia* (Meyer-Lübke, *Grammatik*, I, § 511).

Another well-marked tendency of Italian is to subordinate the reduplication to the presence of the accent on the preceding vowel. This is notably apparent in proparoxytons, as *cómmodo*, *cáttedra*,

fēmmina, in which the equilibrium between the accented part of the word and the two following syllables is secured by lengthening the consonant, a tendency traceable to Vulgar Latin as shown by the *cammara* of the *Appendix Probi*. When the vowel marked by the secondary accent is short and followed immediately by *l*, *m*, *n*, or *r*, a similar reduplication takes place: *péllagrīno*, *tóllerāre*, *cámmināre* (Meyer-Lübke, *Grammatik*, I, § 548). This connection between accent and reduplication is old and is confirmed by the simplification of originally double consonants whenever through a suffix they are placed before the accent (Stolz, *Hist. Gramm.*, pp. 225 f.): *canna* (Gr. *κάννα*):*canalis*; *far*, *farris*:*farrea* (= *farsio*):*farina*; *mamma*:*mamilla*; *offa* (= *odhwa*):*ofella*, etc.

We may now sum up the results of this inquiry, which has been mainly lexicological, and to draw from it some general conclusions.

Of all the Romance languages, Italian alone has preserved double consonants, and, what is more important, has even increased their number, both by assimilation and by reduplication (*sappia*, *acqua*, *femmina*; cf. *supra*). This induces us to believe that we have to do with an old and innate tendency of the Italians, probably prior to their Latinization. The numerous cases of reduplication in popular Latin considered in this light appear as manifestations of a general latent tendency of the language, as is the case, for instance, with assimilation, dissimilation, etc., rather than as the product of a regular and universal phonetic law. This, no doubt, is the impression gathered from a consideration of the numerous cases of reduplication mentioned in this study. The process works with many variations and irregularities. Moreover, while it is so largely represented in Vulgar Latin, there are even more cases in which the consonants did not undergo the change. To discover the real causes of the phenomenon, one has, of course, to consider closely the conditions in which it takes place, from the point of view both of semantics and of phonetics.

With regard to semantics, one cannot but be struck by the great number of reduplications in appellatives. The fact that this phenomenon is not limited to Latin makes it more certain that we have not to do here with a mere coincidence. There are psychological

reasons for this situation and they do not seem to be very mysterious. It is a well-known and very common fact that the accent is pushed back in vocatives. This is especially observable in Greek (*δέσποτα, πάτερ, Περικλεις*). Persons are seldom called without some emphasis, some passion, some imperiousness, and, let us say also, without some haste. This explains why there is a tendency to raise the voice at the beginning of the appellatives and to give much stress or pitch to the syllable marked with the strong ictus. The breath is halted by the contraction of the muscles, and the accumulated air is violently ejected in the act. The accented syllable, one of the first—generally the first—receives the greater part of the stress. It is thus exaggerated at the expense of the others, and more so than is the case with any other syllables marked with the stress accent. It really becomes the only syllable that counts, the characteristic sound of the call. Nothing could be more natural than the dropping of the other syllables, so frequent in so-called “Kosenamen,” and the reduplication of the last consonant pronounced, since the surplus of stress is expended upon it. Appellatives are addressed to the persons in the same way as names, and one may thus apply to *varro, vorri, lippus* the same observations as to the proper names. One should remember also that in proper names, in many qualificatives, and even in a great many other words found in my list the reduplicated form is clearly an abbreviation of a longer one with single consonant: *cūppes:cupidus, suppus:supinus, vorri:vorax, lacca:lacertus, cappa:capitulare, *cattia:catinus, *bottia:botulus*, etc. This replacing of a suppressed syllable by a reduplication produces in the rhythm of speech an effect very much the same as the *κατάληξις* in the endings of verses.

In the dialects of Northern France and of Belgian Hainault, a case of enclisis has led to the same reduplication with syncope: *donnez-moi > doném; prenez-le > pernèll; mets-toi > mèt*.

The reduplication in onomatopoeas and in children's words is also easily explainable. Children's words are mostly calls. They are centripetal or centrifugal. The rhythm of speech with them is mostly constituted by repeated short syllables or by lengthened endings (*pā, mā, papp, mamm*). The emphatic character of the reduplication in children's words has been shown by Idelberger

(*Entwicklung der Kindersprache*, p. 39). He observes that the sensations of children are too intense to be expressed by recto-*tono* words.

As to imitative words, which are also an important part of the language of children and no negligible one with adults, they would lose their whole value if they did not convey a vivid impression either of the noise which they reproduce or of the sensation with which they are associated by some physical connection. They are thus by their nature emphatic, at least from the phonetic point of view. This article contains a pretty long list of such words. They, however, are only a small part of those mentioned in Meyer-Lübke's *Etymological Dictionary*.

Though in a few cases one might have to do with Romance creations, the great extension of most of these words makes it probable that they already existed in Vulgar Latin, and we thus have reasons to believe that Vulgar Latin was very creative and very emotional, as is, after all, generally the case with popular languages. There has been in recent times a tendency to minimize the importance of the "Schallwörter" in language. The situation in Vulgar Latin and primitive Romance, on the contrary, shows that the part played by such spontaneous creations is far from being negligible. Moreover, one should remember that onomatopoeas are not always absolute creations. Words that were not onomatopoeic often come to be felt as such, generally through an association with onomatopoeas of similar meaning or of similar sound, or because the subjective shade of meaning of certain words has been secondarily associated with the very sounds of that word. When, in that way, words penetrate into categories of "Schallwörter," they are assimilated to onomatopoeas, both in form and in meaning. Among the categories of this kind revealed by the present inquiry, are: **potta*, **motta*, **ciotta*: **patla*, **matla*, **ciatla*—**guffus*, **buffo*, **baffa*, **beffa*, **loffa*, **muffa*—**tuccare*, **ticcare*, **taccare*—**broccus*, **froccus*, **rocca*, *occa*, etc.

In onomatopoeas, the suggestive syllables are naturally emphasized and articulated with a special ictus. What has been said about the appellatives, therefore, also applies to them in a great measure. Now, most of the names of animals marked with the reduplication are

onomatopoeic. If double consonants are found in others, it is either because they were used as appellatives or because that phonetic peculiarity had become a mark of familiarity. The latter motive accounts for the same feature in names of plants, of instruments of daily use, parts of the body, etc. All these categories also appear with diminutive suffixes, because they are likely to be used with a tinge of familiarity: cf. *cultellus* "knife," *conucula* "distaff," *martellus* "hammer," *mateola* "club," *geniculum* "knee," *auricula* "ear," *nasellus* "snout," *corpusculum* "body" (Gregory of Tours). Many of these reduplicated words, moreover, have a decidedly ironical or depreciative character: *lippus*, *varro*, *vorri*, *succo*, *suppus*—*vappa*, *pottus*, *cattia*, *bacca*, *sappus*, *succa*, *cappa*, *maccus*, etc. After all, the reduplication seems to have corresponded to a special rhythmus or ictus that was decidedly popular and familiar. The curious fact that about one-half of the words of unknown origin which suddenly appear in large areas at the fall of the Roman Empire have double consonants is, of course, due to the popular character of those words on which the spelling could not exert any correcting influence. Most of the Celtic borrowings invaded the familiar language before they were admitted into the general vernacular. This accounts for the great number of reduplications in these foreign words. In the case of Greek, at least, we know that such a change had nothing to do with an adaptation to the phonetics of the original language. Greek consonants, indeed, were rather weaker and softer than the Latin ones, as shown, for instance, by the great number of Greek voiceless explosives transformed into Latin voiced, weak consonants: *κυβερνᾶν* > Lat. *gubernare* "to govern," *κάμματος* > Sp. *gambro* "lobster," *κάλαθος* > *galatus* App. Prob. "basket," *κρίπη* > It. *grotta* "cave," *κρατήρ* > Prov. *graal* "cup, graal," *Ἀκράγας* > *Agrigentum*, *καλόπους* > It. *galoccia* "galosh," *κόρφος* > Fr. *gouffre* "gulf," etc., *πύξος* > Lat. *buxus* "box-tree—*πυξίδα* > Fr. *boîte* "box," *πυρρός* > Lat. *burrus* "scarlet," *φαλλαῖνα* > Lat. *balaena* "whale," *πράττειν* > It. *barattare* "to churn," *παράλυσος* > Wall. *balzin* "cramp."

Our conclusion, therefore, is that the reduplication of consonants in Latin is clearly a semantic and psychical process and follows no regular phonetic law. While to a phonetician the phenomenon would seem capricious, its apportionment in the vocabulary is quite natural

to a psychologist. In fact, reduplication, be it of syllables or of consonants, generally has that character in languages. One finds it in perfective tenses, in intensive or frequentative verbs, in the plural, and in collectives. In most cases it is a reduplication of syllables, but a lengthening of vowels is not rare and the reinforcement of consonants is also found. In Chinook, for instance, the emotional words, both diminutive and augmentative, are expressed by increasing the stress of consonants. It is, of course, also well known that in Semitic the intensive radical of verbs is regularly formed by a reduplication of consonants. To a stem *qatal*, e.g., answers an intensive: Eth. *qattala*, Hebr. *qittel*. Cf. Hebr. *shibbar* "to cut in small pieces," Hebr. *hillech* "to walk," Hebr. *qibber* "to bury many," etc. Cf. Brockelmann, *Vergl. Gramm.*, p. 244. Even in Indo-European the reduplication in "Kosenamen" is not confined to Latin; in Greek, for instance, a woman in childbirth is a *λέκχω*, a womanish man is a *γύννυς* (Meillet, *Mém. Soc. Ling.*, XV, 339).

But if the phenomenon is thus essentially psychical and based on general tendencies of speaking man, why did it take in Latin this special aspect and this remarkable extension? Such questions are generally idle and could be asked in connection with every psychical process in language, for instance, assimilation and dissimilation. They are never completely absent, but some peoples happen to give to them more importance than others. In the present case, however, it is possible to point to two circumstances which are likely to have brought about the extension of the phenomenon: First, there were in Vulgar Latin an unusually large number of onomatopoeas and spontaneous formations with double consonant which invited the propagation of that feature upon other words having the same familiar or emphatic character. The association of double consonant with emphasis may even have been helped by the frequent use in Vulgar Latin of reinforced demonstratives: *hicce*, *hocce* and, especially of the emphatic particles: *ecce*, *eccum* (It. *ecco*). They were of very frequent occurrence themselves, and, moreover, they were frequently united with pronouns: *eccille*, *ecciste* (Fr. *celle*, *celui*, *cet*, *cette*). This repeated use of double *c* with this shade of feeling would have been sufficient to make it the phonetic symbol of emphasis. A further reason, however, of another kind was the great force of the Latin accent. A strong ictus, as

is well known, marked the initial syllable in old Latin and later was made to coincide with the former pitch accent of words. Now, all the older cases of reduplication are in the initial syllable, and all the later cases are at least in accented ones. The association of this phenomenon with the stress of the word, at all periods of Latin, is quite evident. But another circumstance, no less remarkable which has been strangely overlooked, is that, but for a very small number of exceptions, the reduplicated consonants are strong voiceless explosives, such as *c*, *t*, *p*. No explanation which neglects to account for either of these circumstances can be accepted as satisfactory. We must admit that in case an explosive of this type immediately follows an accented vowel, the speaker has to produce at a short interval two great efforts, one to give due stress to the accented syllable and then another to articulate the strong consonant. In both cases there is a violent expulsion of breath. It is, of course, to be expected that the tendency will be toward combining those two efforts into one, in the co-ordination of movements which unceasingly takes place in our articulations. The feeling for rhythm can also bring about that result. In this way one great effort is followed by a relatively long silence, after which the organs relax for the following weaker syllable. Sommer, in his *Historical Grammar* (p. 300), thinks that a mere shifting in the division of syllables would be sufficient to account for the production of the phenomenon: the articulation of the consonant in the syllable following the accent would have begun already in the preceding one. This explanation, however, does not furnish any reason for this change in the division of syllables, nor for the fact that the reduplicated consonants are voiceless. It is a mere acknowledgment of the fact, nothing more. When, on the other hand, Groeber (*Comm. Woelfflin.*, p. 175) says that the reduplication is due to the staccato-pronunciation of the Italians, he seems to overlook the fact that, if the staccato-pronunciation may help in preserving pre-existent double consonants, one does not well conceive how it could create them. It is indeed, by definition, in opposition to such an encroachment of one syllable upon the other. Besides, both scholars have nothing to say about the repartition of the phenomenon and they completely ignore the semantic aspect of the process.

As a complement to this study we should say a word about the shortening of the vowel which normally takes place in case the following consonant is reduplicated (cf. *cuppa* : *cūpa*). The phenomenon is easy to understand, and is a mere dynamic process. If one added to the accented syllable a long silence, one would make it out of proportion with the other syllables. It is a question of rhythmus. The alternation between long vowel+single consonant and short vowel+double consonant is quite normal and is found, for instance, in Hebrew, after the article and the copula:

wā-bhōhū "and waste":	{ way yō 'mer "and He said."
	{ wat-tō-çê' "and caused to go forth."
hā-rāgīa ^{uc} "the expanse":	{ ham-māyim "the waters."
	{ haggdhōlīm "the great."

Finally, we have to mention a very special case of reduplication in Vulgar Latin: the reduplication of *m* in the ending of the first person plural of the contracted perfect: *amavi*, *audivi* are conjugated in Vulgar Latin: *amai*, *amasti*, *amaut* or *amat* or *amait*, *amammus*, *amastis*, *amarunt*; *audi*, *audisti*, *audit* or *audiut*, *audimmus*, *audistis*, *audirunt*. The reasons given for the lengthening of the *m* in *amammus*, *audimmus* are either a need for compensation for the loss of a syllable, or the desire to distinguish the perfect from the present (Grandgent, *Introd. to VL*, p. 178).

Such considerations at best might account for the maintenance of *mm*, but would not give any explanation for its production. In fact, *-avimus* phonetically was expected to develop into either **aimus* or *-aumus*. Cf. on one side: *failla* for *favilla* in the *Appendix Probi*, *Flainus* for *Flavinus* in *Insc. Hisp. Chist.*, 146; on the other: *gauta* for *gabata* in *Fr. joue*, *avica* for *auca* in *Fr. oie*, etc. One can also conceive that by analogy with the other persons of the tense, it would have become *-amus*. *-ammus*, on the contrary, is an improbable transformation. It would not, it is true, be completely impossible even phonetically, since occasionally a double consonant has evolved from *v*+consonant, as in *It. città* from *civitatem*, *It. motta*, *smotta* "landslip" from *movita*, and perhaps in *Fr. jatte*, if it is from *gauta* and not from *gabta*. But *mm* for *vm* is phonetically surprising, and I think that the real origin of *-ammus*, *-immus* is to be found in

the existence of a few very frequent strong perfects in which *mm* resulted from other consonants + *m*: as *dimmus* from *dicmus* for *dicimus*, *fimmus* from *fīcmus* for *fēcimus*, and more especially *dëmmus*, from *dēdimus*, which had been extended to many a verb ending in *d*: *descendëmmus*, *respondëmmus*, *re(n)dëmmus*, etc. The influence of forms of so frequent occurrence must have been very great, and their emphatic character made them extremely suitable for the perfect. Here also the double consonant is a symbol of emphasis as it has so often appeared to be in this article.

ALBERT J. CARNOY

UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

NOTES ON ROMANIC *e* AND *i*

1. FACIE

Where a consonant stood between a stressed vowel and hiatus-*i*, the stressed vowel is generally short and the following sound long or double in Italian. This principle is plain with regard to labials: *sappia* < *sapiat*, *trebbio* < **triββiu* < *triviu*, *vendemmia* < *uindēmia*.¹ Likewise the short vowel of *faccia*, beside the long one of *noce*, allows us to assume **fakkiat* < *faciat*. From the differences between *pozzo* (*póttso*) < *puteu*, *raggio* < *radiu* and *ragione* < *rationē*, it would seem that lengthening was earliest after a main-stressed vowel. Such forms as *sappiamo* and *vendemmiare* may therefore be considered later developments than *sappia* and *vendemmia*.

In cases like *cascio* (*kaššo*) < *caseu*, *foglia* (*fōlla*) < *folia*, *vigna* (*viñña*) < *uīnea*, the consonants were presumably lengthened before they were palatalized. A different development is found in connection with *r*: the stressed vowel of *aja* is long, according to the transcriptions given in the *Matre phonétique*, XXVIII, 2. This shows that *r* was not palatalized in Italian as *l* and *n* were, but was simply dropped. *Cascio* is a variant of *cacio*, pronounced *kāšo* with a long *a* which indicates that in many varieties of Tuscan speech the formation of *š* from *si* was earlier than the development of **sappiat*, and that *cascio* therefore has *šš* < *ssi* < *si*.²

Outside of Italy the doubling of *p*, before hiatus-*i*, is implied by the voiceless sounds of Portuguese *aipo* < **appiu* < *apiu*, Spanish *apio*, Catalan *api*, Provençal *api*, French *ache*.³ Other occlusives were doubled to form Portuguese *ç* in *faça* < *faciat*, *poço* < *puteu*, while *razão* corresponds to Italian *ragione*. Likewise French *fasse*

¹ I use *β* for bilabial *v*; *λ* = Portuguese *lh*; *ñ* = Spanish *ñ*; *ŋ* = English final *ng*; *θ* = *th* in *thin*. In phonetic spellings a grave accent indicates stressed vowels that are open, an acute those that are close.

² Outside of Tuscany, words like *noce* and *cacio* are often pronounced with *u*. This treatment of *noce* may have a historic basis, but more probably it arose from the misreading of Tuscan spelling. The Tuscan word *ci* is *u**i* or *si*, depending on the sound that precedes; but such variation is unknown in many regions of Italy, and *u**i* has been adopted as the standard form. The use of *u* in *cacio* is certainly wrong: this spelling owes its origin to the pronunciation of *c* as a simple fricative in words like *noce*, *pace*, *vece*.

³ Portuguese *b* in *saiba* and Spanish *b* in *sepa* are analogic (*Archiv*, CXXXIII, 411).

represents **fakkiat* < *faciat*. In the west, hiatus-*i* caused the lengthening of non-occlusives too, aside from *r* and *s*. A formation of *λλ* and *ññ* is proved by the checked vowels found before *λ* and *ñ* in French. It is a mistake to say, as Nyrop does in his French grammar (I, § 207), that *feuille* and *mieus* imply free vowels before *λ*: the development of diphthongs here was due to palatal-contact in **fōλλa* and **mēλλos*. Early Provençal has *fuelha*, *fuolha*,¹ and *miel(h)s*,² although it lacks diphthongs in the equivalents of French *cuer* and *pied*. These Provençal breakings were due to palatal-contact, and it is unreasonable to ascribe the parallel French formations to any other cause.

The stressed vowels of Spanish *cuña* (=Portuguese *cunha*) and *tiña* (=Portuguese *tinha*) show that intervocalic *ne* changed through *ni* to *ññ*, in Hispanic, before *pira* became *péra*.³ The formation of *camiar*, beside *cambiar*, indicates that where stressless hiatus-*i* was not absorbed it was changed to *e*, and then to close *i* about the time that *mb* became *mm*.⁴ From the stressed vowel of *vendimia*, it is clear that before the *é* of **fédzi* or **fédzi* changed to *i*, **vendēmea* became **vendēmia* with a close *i* which had the same effect as the derivative of *i*. The difference between *mucha* < **mūlta* < **mūlta* < **multa* and *troja* < **trōlla* < *trullea* shows that intervocalic *λλ* was not developed in Hispanic until after hiatus-*i* had changed through *e* to close *i*.

The hiatus-development of stressless *i* > *e* > *i* was probably general in France and Italy, though a chronology differing from that of Hispanic must be assumed for these and other vowel-changes in many dialects of France. In the north *pira* and *gula* underwent alteration before *ññ* was developed; and the *i* of **vendēmia* changed to *dž* before the derivative of *fēci* became **fidzi*. In the south the formation of *ññ* was nearly contemporary with the development of *gōla*.⁵ The existence of *vendimio* in modern Provençal, as a variant of *vendēmio* < *uindēmia*, shows that the change of **vendēmea* to *vendemia* (with close *i*) was in some regions earlier, and in others later,

¹ Compare modern *fidha* in southern Languedoc.

² Compare modern *mié(u)s* in Provence.

³ *Modern Philology*, XI, 350.

⁴ *Ibid.*, XII, 188.

⁵ *Ibid.*, XI, 351.

than the activity of vowel-harmony. For the benefit of persons who might feel inclined to doubt the probability of a general Romanic development $i > e > i$, involving $e > i > e > i$ in the derivatives of *rubeu* and *trullea*, it may be well to mention the fact that stressless $u > o > u$ is normal in Portuguese and Rumanian, and $i > e > i$ (before a consonant) common in both of these languages.¹

The following table shows the relative order of some of the developments mentioned above:

tinea	timētis	faciēs	sapiat	trullea
*tīnia	"	"	"	*trūllia
*tīnnia	"	*fakkiēs	*sappiat	"
tīñña	"	"	"	"
"	*temétes	*fakkēs	*sapeat	trūllea

Among the various sound-changes implied by the Romanic tongues, one of the earliest was that of stressless hiatus-*e* to *i*. Hiatus-*i* caused the lengthening of any consonant, other than *r*, after a main-stressed vowel. The voiced consonants of western Romanic indicate, however, widespread formations of *š* from *si*, and of *tš* or *ts* from *ti*, earlier than the period represented by the third line of the foregoing table. In southern continental Romanic, *tinnia made tīñña, with *i* due to palatal-contact (harmonic change of stressed vowels being unknown in Tuscan and a much later development in the west), and soon afterward close *e* replaced hiatus-*i*. But in a large portion of France, *tinnia became *tīnnea, *ténnea, *ténnia, *tēñña, parallel with the general treatment of *li* in continental Romanic: *palea* > **palia* > **pallia* > **pallea* > **pallia* > *παλλα*. As French did not form *λt* from *lt*, there is no direct evidence of northern **pallea*, corresponding to Hispanic **trólla* < **tróllia* < **tróllea*. But the *ó* of *boil* < **bólla* < *bullio* and the *é* of **tēñña* agree with the Hispanic evidence, and allow us to assume **pallea* in French. In Sardinian we find *ndz* as the derivative of intervocalic *ni*: this non-assimilation of the second element corresponds to Sardinian regressive *nn* < *ηn* beside the progressive-regressive *ññ* < *ηn* of Italian and western Romanic. Aside from tīñña, the developments shown in the table seem to have been shared by all varieties of continental Romanic.

¹ *Romanic Review*, I, 431.

The alteration of *timētis* to **temētes* was earlier than that of *pira* to *péra*. A mathematic proof of this difference can hardly be given, but the grounds for assuming it can be made plain to anyone familiar with the general symmetry of sound-changes. The continental formation of *é* from *i* was earlier than that of *ó* from *ù*: this is proved by Rumanian *lemn* < *līgnu* beside *pumn* < *pūgnu*, with normal *e* and *u*; and by Italian *legno*, Catalan *llenya*, Spanish *leño*, Portuguese *lenho*, beside *pugno*, *puny*, *puño*, *punho*, with *u* due to palatal-contact, the change of *ɣn* to *ññ* being earlier than that of *ù* to *ó*, but later than that of *i* to *é*. The contrary *ó* of French **póñño* > *poin* does not affect the general principle; it shows merely that in certain regions the formation of *ññ* was later than the change of *ù* to *ó*. French evidence in regard to *i* and *ù* is found in *correie* beside *fuie*, and this difference, which arose from the weakening of *g* to a fricative, has parallels in southern Romanic. Likewise inscriptional evidence implies that *e* < *i* was earlier than *o* < *u*.¹

The change of stressless *u* to *o* was earlier than that of stressed *u* to *o*. This is indicated by stressless *u* > *o* in Rumanian, the sound *o* being sometimes preserved on account of stress-displacement: *acòlo* < *acolò* < *eccu illòc*, *popòr* < *populu*. In a few words Rumanian *o* or *oa* seems to represent a Latin stressed *u*; but, as I have shown in the *Modern Language Review*, IX, 496, such cases are not comparable with western *gòla* < *gula*. In some of these words the vowel-variation belongs to Latin, for example *noru* = *nuru*, **ploia* = *pluvia*. In other cases the real sources have been ignored: *ròbeu* and *roseu*, not *rubeu* and *russeu*, correspond to the Rumanian forms with *o*. In *toamnă* for **tumnă* < *autumna*, a Latin *o*-basis seems to be lacking; but there are several ways of explaining this change of *u* to *o*, the cause of the alteration being some *o*-word with a similar meaning, perhaps Slavonic *doba*, "season." And in certain cases *o* is only a Rumanian contraction: *cot* < *cubitu* is parallel with *nor* = *nùâr* < *nūbīlu*.

We may therefore say that Rumanian represents a Romanic speech-period which had developed *e* from *ī* and stressless (but not stressed) *o* from *ū*. A trace of the same period is perhaps to be seen in Spanish *cochiello* < *cultellu* and *cotral* < **cullerāle*. In early

¹ Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung*¹, § 84; *ibid.*², § 93.

Hispanic, *l* was generally *u*-like at the end of a syllable, but it became the *i*-like sound λ after *u* (not close *o*: *sōlitāriu* > *soltero*). Apparently **culterāle* developed *o* before *multa* became **mūlta*, and thus it escaped a formation of λ ; later the first *l* was lost by dissimilation. The *u* of *cutral* may be analogic, since a derivative of *cultru* would have had \acute{u} in Hispanic; or perhaps *cutral* < *cotral* was parallel with *lugar* < *logar*, the *o* of each word being in contact with a velar sound. The *o* of *cochiello* seems to show that *cultellu* became **koltēllo* before λ was developed in **mūlta*, and that the later influence of **kūltro* or **kūltro* changed **koltēllo* to **koltēllo*. The *u* of *cuchillo* agrees with that of *mujer* < *mogier*, but could have also developed like *u* in *cutral*.

Romanic stressed *e* < *i* was earlier than stressed *o* < *u*, and stressless *o* < *u* was earlier than stressed *o* < *u*. These facts justify the assumption that stressless *e* < *i* was earlier than stressless *o* < *u* and earlier than stressed *e* < *i*. The change of *timēre* to *temēre* was what caused *timet* to become **tēmet*. The difference between the stems of contemporary *temēre* and *timet* was felt to be illogical beside **deβēre* and **dēβet*: from *temēre* and numerous other such words came the general tendency that produced a change of *i* to *é* in continental Romanic. This development of *é* was evidently later than the formation of close *i* in words like *tiñña* and *via*; French *veie* is an analogic variant of *vie*, due to the influence of normal *veage* and *enveer*,¹ modern *vī* < *uia* being found in dialects that shared with literary French the development *foi* < *fide*, *toi* < *tē*.² Parallel with *temēre* and **tēmet* for discordant *temēre* and *timet*, the change of *tussire* to *tossire* caused **tūssēt* to become **tósset* at a later time, in Italy and the west. Rumanian separated from Italian after *tossire* was established, but before *ū* became *ó*; it did not develop a general *ó* < *ū* of its own, but changed stressless *o* back to *u*, thus leveling the formerly different vowels derived from the *u*'s of *tussire* and *tussi*.³

We may make a further distinction and say that posttonic *e* < *i* was probably earlier than pretonic *e* < *i*. Evidence in regard to the matter seems to be displayed in Sardinian. Logudorian

¹ *Modern Language Review*, IX, 495; X, 247.

² *Revue des patois gallo-romans*, II, 257; III, 287.

³ In modern Rumanian the equivalents of **tussisce* and **tussiscit* have replaced the verb-form **tusc*, but the noun *tusc* has kept normal stressed *u*.

distinguishes stressed $e < \bar{e}$, $i < \bar{i}$, $o < \bar{o}$, $u < \bar{u}$, and the stressless endings $-o < -\bar{o}$, $-u < -\bar{u}$, $-os < -\bar{o}s$, $-us < -\bar{u}s$; but apparently it shared, to some extent, the continental leveling of posttonic \bar{i} and e . Unfortunately it is not easy to find many trustworthy examples of this development. Persons who wish to deny its reality might say that *turre* comes from *turre*, not from *turri*; that *fàghere* is responsible for the e of *faghes*, *faghet*; that *benit* < *uenit* is normal, rather than an analogic formation dependent on the \bar{i} of *uenīs* or *uenīre*; and that the e of the imperative plural has gotten into the indicative-endings *-ades* and *-ides*, which are found in the present only, other tenses having *-dzis* < **-dzi* < **-dz* < *-tis*. But such an argument can be turned around: the ending of the noun *sidis* need not be called normal. It is hard to understand why this nominative was kept, instead of the accusative; but its stressless i may be explained in various ways.

Sardic is fond of assimilation and dissimilation: assimilated *sidis* < **sides* < *sītīs* would be no more remarkable than *a* < *aut*, *arbore* < *arbore*, *fae* = *fa* < *faba*, Campidanian *tanaxi* = Logudorian *tenaghe* < *tenāce*, and *tuo* < *tuu* in a dialect that regularly distinguishes final o and u .¹ Or perhaps the i came from the \bar{i} of *sītīre* and *sītītu*, the latter being represented by *sididu*, "thirsty." As Sardic shared with all other Romanic tongues the change of stressless hiatus- e to i , it is clear that *siti* would have kept or re-developed i before a vowel, and the accusative may have affected the nominative. So too the ablative *sītī* could have influenced the nominative: the declension **sītīs-sītī* might have come from the associated word *famēs-famē*. With regard to the ablative, it is noteworthy that in southern Sardic, which has *bōnu* < *bonu* beside *bōnus* < *bonōs*, the o of *dōmu* points to the ablative *domō* as plainly as the *dōmo* of central dialects that distinguish final o and u .² Of course the form *dōmo* arose from *in domō* and other such phrases; but then *sītī* could likewise follow a preposition.

Southern Sardic has changed posttonic e and o to i , u , as shown in some of the words mentioned above. Otherwise its vowel-system

¹ Wagner, *Lautehre der sardsardischen Mundarten*, Halle, 1907, p. 17. In Sardic spelling, as in Genoese, z means the sound \bar{z} (= French j). Many Sardic dialects have, like Spanish, developed voiced fricatives from intervocalic p , t , k ; I keep the ordinary spellings with b , d , $g(h)$, as the fricative quality does not seem to be distinctive.

² Wagner, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

is generally like that of Logudorian. A peculiar difference is seen, however, in the verb *suèxiri* = Logudorian *sutghere*, meaning "knead." These words do not come from *subigere* as Wagner assumes,¹ for *digitu* > *didu* has lost *g* in the south and north alike; they represent *subicere*, with normal treatments of the sound *k*. Neither does Wagner's theory of the southern *e* seem reasonable: he supposes that it was borrowed from other verbs with radical *e* before *ž*, such as *strèxiri* (< **ex-traicere* ?), meaning "clean." But this ending, which would usually require a Latin *e* (*decēre* > *dèxiri*), is not found in a great many other verbs.

The real reason for the *e* of *suèxiri* is probably to be sought in the word itself. *Subicit* made normal **sùβeket*, and this produced **sùβékere* with analogic *é*, just as in Spanish the *ñ* of *tañe* has replaced the *ng* of *tango* and the *ndz* of forms with stressed *e* or *i*.² We may therefore say that Romanic stressless *e* < *i* was an earlier development than stressed *e* < *i*: a trace of the difference is preserved in Campidanian *suèxiri*. Logudorian *sutghere* does not disprove a formation of **sùβeket* in the north; it only shows that there was no analogic change of *i* to *e* in this verb.

In Sardinian, as in the other Romanic tongues, intervocalic *ki* made *tš* or *ts* (with a lengthened *t* in many dialects): from **laku* come southern *lattu*, central *ladžu* and *laðu*,³ northern *lattu*⁴ and *lattu*. But before *k* underwent a change of quality, **fakkiēs* became **fakkēs*. Logudorian has *fakke* beside *cabu* < *caput*, *ladus* < *latus*, *logu* < *locu*, *paghe* < *pace*. Early Campidanian has a form spelled *fachi* and *faki*, which would have developed *tš* in the modern language, beside *cabu*, *ladus*, *logu*, and *pagi* corresponding to modern *paxi*. The general voicing of occlusives indicates a basis **fakkie* for *faki* as well as for *fakke* (which is sometimes written with a single *k*, consonant-quantity being less distinct in Sardinian than in Tuscan). From the foregoing remarks about Sardinian *e* and *i*, it will be seen that *fakke* and *faki* can be explained in more than one way.

If Sardinian shared with continental Romanic the change of **pallia* to **pallea*, we might call *fakke* and *faki* normal. But if we assume

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

² *Modern Philology*, VIII, 596. Galician has analogic *tanzo* and *tangue* beside normal *tango* and *tanze* (*z* = *š*).

³ Compare Castilian *ts* > *θ*.

⁴ Compare Swedish *p* > *t*.

that stressless open *e* and close *e* were distinguished, as the development of *mulier* seems to show, it is possible that *fakke* < **fakkee* was analogic, due to normal **fakkēs* < **fakkeēs* < *faciēs*. Or we may suppose that even though stressless close *e* and open *e* were commonly distinguished, they were assimilated at the end of a word: something of the same kind is to be seen in Italian *grue* beside *dì* and *buono* < *bonu* beside *bue* (=Spanish *buey*) < **búoe* < **bòe* < *boue*. It is also possible that the change of **fakkee* to *fakke* was parallel with western *mal* and *mar*, the final vowel being dropped rather than assimilated.

On the continent, *faciēs* > **fakkēs* was normal, in accord with **pallia* > **pallea*, **sappiat* > **sappeat*; but the formation of **fakke* may have been analogic as in Sardinian. The difference between Spanish *haz* and Portuguese *face* corresponds to *hoz* = *fouce* < *falce*, *tos* = *tosse* < *tussi*. Portuguese *face*, beside *paz* (*paš* < **padz*) < *pace*, shows that final *e* could be dropped after *dz* or *dz*, but not after *tš* or *ts*; contrary dialectal *pouz* (*póš* < **pòuts*) < **paucē*¹ belongs to a border-region that has other Spanish-like features, such as *rêzio* for *rijo* < **ricidu*,² *si* for *sim*,³ *sim* for *sem*,³ *barrer* for *varrer*.⁴

In France and Italy the change of **fakkie* to **fakke* seems to have produced a feeling that this shortening was incorrect. But the longer form could not be restored while **sappeat* was the equivalent of older **sappiat*. The earlier structure of the word could be imitated only by adding a different vowel. On account of the gender, the vowel was *a*: **fakke* became **fakkea*. In Italy this noun developed like the verb **fakkeat* > *faccia*. In France we find evidence that the addition of *a* was rather late, at least in some of the southern dialects. Early Provençal has *fatz* = Spanish *haz*, and also *facia* beside *faça* corresponding to Italian *faccia*. In the modern language *facia* has become *faci(o)*, parallel with *vendemia* > *vendemi(o)*.

2. FILIOLA

It is generally held that *filiola* became **filiōla* as the result of a mechanical development: the stress was transferred from *i* to the

¹ *Modern Philology*, XII, 195.

² *Revista lusitana*, X, 240; *Modern Philology*, XI, 350.

³ *Revista lusitana*, X, 243.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, VIII, 298.

opener sound *o*. While the reality of the stress-change cannot be questioned, the common idea of its cause is probably wrong. With a purely mechanical treatment, *filiola* would have made **filila*, and later **filéla* outside of Sardinia. If the *o* was not lost, it was because this vowel was felt to be an essential element of the word. It was therefore kept in the only way that it could be for any great length of time, after the change of *altera* to *altra*, by means of a stress-displacement. As the same displacement occurred in *faseolu*, there is no reason for ascribing it to the relative openness of the vowels. It is possible that *area* > *aria* produced analogic stressed *i* in **ariola*, though this theory is needless and probably wrong; but there was no such basic form that could have put analogic *i* in the place of the *è* of *faseolu*. We must therefore admit that in the derivatives of this word *èo* changed through *eò* to *iò*.

3. HODIE

Latin *gründio* had a variant form *grünnio*; from the latter come Portuguese *grunho* and Spanish *gruño*, with normal *û* > *ú* due to *ñ*-contact as in *cunha* = *cuña*. But it is unreasonable to say with regard to the Romanic development of *uerēcundia*, as Cornu does in Gröber's *Grundriss (Die port. Sprache, § 111)*, that this noun had a variant with *nn*. On the contrary, there is clear evidence showing that the *d* was kept until after *gula* became *góla*: Italian has *ó* in *vergogna* (*vergóñña*), beside *u* in *giugnere*, *pugno*, *ugna*. Likewise in the other languages that changed *û* to *ú* before early *ñ*, *-undia* made **-ûndea* > **-óndea* > **-óndia* > **-óñña*. Thus Catalan *vergonya*, Spanish *vergüeña*, and Portuguese *vergonha* correspond to *cegonya* = *cigüeña* = *cegonha*.¹

We may therefore assume that in general the Romanic palatalizations of *d* were later than the change of *û* to *ó*, and consequently later than the separation of Italian from Rumanian and Sardinian. Yet it is plain that the derivatives of *hodiē* do not directly represent a form **oddē* corresponding to **fakkēs* < **fakkiēs*, which (as explained above) lost *i* before *trüllea* became **tróllea*. Sardinian *oe* could have come from **odē*, if such a form ever existed, but the other languages

¹ In *Modern Philology*, XI, 350, the Spanish development should read as follows: **vergōñña* > **vergōñha* > *vergüeña*.

require (and Sardinian admits) a basis with a palatalized *d*. There seems to be only one way out of this difficulty: *hodiē* became **oddē*; but afterward, when **sappeat* had changed back to **sappiat*, *i* was restored from the noun *diē*. A parallel for such influence is to be seen in Portuguese *alheio*, Spanish *ajeno*, Campidanian *allenu* (with normal *ll* as in *folla* < *folia*), Logudorian *andzenu* (corresponding to *fodza* < *folia* or *bindza* < *uīnea*): these forms imply a stem *aliēn-* or **alliēn-* for normal **alēn-* < *aliēn-*, with *i* borrowed from the related words **allios* and **allius* < **alleus* < **allius* < *alius*.¹

4. MULIER

If continental **fakke* was normal, and not due to the influence of **fakkes* < *faciēs*, it would seem that *mulier* should have made Italian **mölle* < **mülle(r)* < **müllier*. In this case we could assume that every stressless *e* became close after *i* changed to *e*, and that the *λλ* of *moglie* came from normal *mogliere* < **molière* < **moleère* < **muleère* < **mulière*. But if *moglie* is normal, representing **möllie* < **möllee(r)* < **mülle(r)* < **müllier*, we must assume that stressless open *e* and close *e* were distinguished after the change of *i* to *e*. This would agree with *bène* < *bene*, in which the restressed stressless *e* has remained open, although it was not anciently stressed often enough to become *ie*. Since *moglie* is the usual Italian form, it seems hardly probable that its development was analogic. It is more likely that both *moglie* and *mogliere* are normal. In any case we must call *mogliere* normal with respect to **mulière*, and assume that hiatus-*e* remained close. If every stressless *e* had become open, the Italian forms would be **mölle* and **mol(l)ière*.

As an independent word, *muliere* would have made **mulire* > **molère* in continental Romanic. But the influence of the nominative hindered this development. Instead the *e* became stressed, thereby keeping the nominative and the accusative fairly similar: **mulière* replaced *muliere*, and thus the half-stressed vowel of each form corresponded to the main-stressed vowel of the other.

¹ As most Sardinian dialects lack *λλ* and *σσ*, Meyer-Lübke is wrong in supposing that **alus* changed **alenus* to **alenus* (*Einführung*, § 101; *ibid.*, § 110). If the derivative of *alius* was kept long enough, it must have made **alalos*, not **alus*, on the continent; but at an early time it was driven out by the noun derived from *alliu*. Because of this leveling, which produced an intolerable ambiguity, "other" was expressed by derivatives of *alteru* and *alid*.

5. PARIETE

Stress-analogy caused *muliere* to become **mulière*, and may have helped in producing **filiòla* beside *filia*. But such influence is not easy to establish with regard to *pariete* and *pariēs*. In English the conflict between written *whom* and spoken *who* (objective) has lasted for centuries, and may go on indefinitely. So too the struggle with non-personal nominatives like *pariēs* may have reached through a long time. Meyer-Lübke says that the genitive **parētis* may have been analogic, due to normal **parēs* < *pariēs*.¹ This statement is correct but incomplete: it is also possible that *pariēs* produced analogic **pariētis*. It should, however, be noted that the stem of *pède* was not affected by the *ē* of *pēs*. It is therefore most probable that *pariete* > *parête* was a normal development, and that *pariēs* was lost (morphologically) before *mulier* caused *muliere* to become **mulière*.

If *pariete* had become **pariête*, its derivative would have been **pariête*² or **pajête* in Italian, and **paried* or **periede* > **piried* in Spanish. Rumanian *părete*, Italian *parete*, and the western equivalents, which have or imply a close *e*, are based on **pariē*, a normal shortening of *pariete* parallel with *domnus* for *dominus*. This reduction of *pariete* was earlier than the formation of close *i* from the *i* of *uia*. If the historic nominative was kept long enough, **parēs* was contemporary with **pariē*. A declension **parēs*-**pariē* would have been similar to the *hospes*-*hospite* of classic Latin, aside from a difference in stress like that of *nepōs*-*nepōte*.

I have mentioned above Meyer-Lübke's correct statement about **parēs*. In the new edition of his work, he gives up his former view: we now read that the retention (*Bewahrung*) of *pariēs* is assured by the development of **fakkie* from *facie*.³ This theory is evidently wrong. Morphologically *pariēs* has been lost. But if it had been kept as *homo* and *mulier* were, it would have become **parēs*, parallel with *quiētus* > *quētus*; this general principle is stated correctly by Meyer-Lübke a few pages farther on,⁴ and repeated in his Romanic

¹ Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung*², § 82.

² The *pariete* given in Petrócchi's dictionary is presumably bookish.

³ Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung*², § 91.

⁴ *Ibid.*, § 110.

dictionary under the word *ariēs*. Hence the term *Bewahrung* has no true application to *pariēs*, beyond this: there was such a word in Latin. It is a mistake to think that the formation of **fakkie* from *facie* can tell us anything about *pariēs*.

We can lengthen most speech-sounds without making appreciable changes of quality. But *r*, sounded as it was in Latin and is in Tuscan, lacks a held position; it can be repeated (as in *terra*), but not simply lengthened. This is why *aria* did not become **arria* when the other consonants were lengthened. The difference between simple *r* and a prolonged trill was so great that it was found more convenient to keep the simple sound. In this there was no real violation of a sound-law; *r* was a special kind of sound, essentially different from other consonants, and therefore it followed a special law of its own. Likewise in early western Germanic the sound *j* (or hiatus-*i*) caused a lengthening of any preceding consonant except *r*.¹

EDWIN H. TUTTLE

NORTH HAVEN, CONN.

CORRECTIONS

In my article on *locus*, printed in *Modern Philology* for last March, the derivation-mark should be reversed in the first line of the first paragraph; in the second line of p. 164, and at the end of the paragraph near the middle of p. 164.

E. H. T.

¹ Streltberg, *Urgermanische Grammatik*, Heidelberg, 1896, § 131.

